arXiv:1609.06515v1 [cs.CC] 21 Sep 2016

The Complexity of the Numerical Semigroup Gap Counting Problem

Shunichi Matsubara
Aoyama Gakuin University
Japan *

Abstract

In this paper, we prove the counting problem of numerical semigroup gaps to be #NP-complete under relaxed subtractive reductions. A relaxed subtractive reduction is a new type of polynomial-time reduction. A numerical semigroup is an additive semigroup over the set of all nonnegative integers. A gap of a numerical semigroup is defined as a positive integer that does not belong to the numerical semigroup. The computation of gaps of numerical semigroups has been actively studied from the 19th century. However, little has been known on the computational complexity. In 2005, Ramírez-Alfonsín proposed a question whether the numerical semigroup gap counting problem is #P-complete. This work is an answer for his question. #NP is a wider class than #P. Which type of polynomial-time reduction we adopt is critical for the completeness of #NP. In particular, there is no #NP-complete problem under Cook reductions while #NP is closed under subtractive reductions. We introduce relaxed subtractive reductions as a generalization of subtractive reductions, and prove that the numerical semigroup gap counting problem is #NP-complete under relaxed subtractive reductions. Moreover, we prove the #NP-completenesses of other two variants of the numerical semigroup gap counting problem under parsimonious reductions.

1 Introduction

The numerical semigroup gap counting problem [RA05, RGS09] has been actively researched from the mathematical point of view since 19th century; e.g., Sylvester [Syl82]. We denote this problem by #NS Gaps. This problem is defined as follows. Given a set A of coprime positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$, the task is counting the number of all integers that cannot be represented as nonnegative integer combinations of A. Then, the set of all integers represented as nonnegative integer combinations of A is a semigroup called

*matsubara@it.aoyama.ac.jp

a *numerical semigroup* [RGS09] and denoted by $\mathcal{S}(A)$. Moreover, an integer not in $\mathcal{S}(A)$ is called a *gap* of the numerical semigroup $\mathcal{S}(A)$ and the set of all gaps of $\mathcal{S}(A)$ is denoted by $N(A)$. An integer in $\mathcal{S}(A)$ is called a *nongap* of $\mathcal{S}(A)$. For example, if $A = \{6, 11, 15\}$ are given, then $N(A)$ consists of 10 integers $1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 19$. For a given set A of coprime positive integers, it is known that $N(A)$ is finite [RGS09, RA05]. Moreover, an element of $N(A)$ is called a gap of the numerical semigroup. Moreover, we call the maximum integer of $N(A)$ the *Frobenius number* and denote it by $g(A)$.

1.1 The computation of the numerical semigroup gap counting problem

In this paper, we assume the reader to be familiar with basic notions and results on computational complexity theory. The reader is referred to textbooks; e.g., Arora and Barak [AB09], Du and Ko [DK00], Papadimitriou [Pap94]. We denote the class of all deterministic and nondeterministic polynomial-time computable decision problems by P and NP, respectively. Moreover, we denote the class of all polynomial-time computable function problems by FP.

In researches for the problem #NS Gaps, there are two standpoints on whether we assume the number n of given coprime positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ to be a parameter of the input. Generally, n is assumed to be variable unless explicitly stated otherwise. This paper follows this convention. More precisely, we consider the sum of the bit lengths of given integers and the number of the given integers to be the parameters of the input of #NS Gaps in this paper.

Little research has been known from the complexity theoretical point of view for the problem #NS Gaps although many results have been known from other viewpoints. Ramírez-Alfonsín (Problem A.4.2 in [RA05]) proposed the following question. *"Is computing $N(a_1, \cdots, a_n)$ $\#\mathcal{P}$-complete?"* (In [RA05], Ramírez-Alfonsín uses the notation $N(A)$ for describing two different concepts; the set of all gaps of $\mathcal{S}(A)$ and its cardinality, where A is a finite set of coprime positive integers. From the context, it is clear to denote the latter in the above question.) This problem has remained open until the present work and we give an answer from the negative side. $\#\mathsf{P}$ is one of the best-known classes of counting problems [Val79a] and the counting counterpart of NP. We formally review the class $\#\mathsf{P}$ formally in Subsection 2.2.

Although there is little result for #NS Gaps from the complexity theoretical point of view, many results have been known on computation of #NS Gaps. Sylvester[Syl82] showed $|N(a_1, a_2)|$ to be $(a_1 - 1)(a_2 - 1)/2$ for two coprime positive integers a_1 and a_2. Section 5 in [RA05] surveys results on equalities and inequalities for #NS Gaps. Barvinok and Woods [BW03]

found a polynomial-time algorithm for counting the number of elements in $N(A)$ under the assumption that the number $|A|$ is fixed. In more detail, they found a short rational function for a generating function that counts all the elements of $N(A)$ [BW03]. However, this algorithm is doubly exponential in the cardinality n of A.

1.2 Variants of the numerical semigroup gap counting problem

This paper concerns counting all elements of $N(A)$ for a given set A of coprime positive integers. This problem is closely related to the problem finding the maximum element of $N(A)$, the Frobenius number $g(A)$, for a given set A of coprime positive integers. This problem has been studied as actively as on #NS Gaps. We call this decision problem the *Frobenius problem* and denote it by Frobenius although the problem is called by several different names; the linear Diophantine problem of Frobenius, the coin exchange problem of Frobenius, and so on. In Frobenius, we also assume the number n of given positive integers to be a parameter of the input unless we explicitly state otherwise. Ramírez-Alfonsín [RA96] proved the Frobenius problem to be NP-hard under Cook reductions. More recently, Matsubara [Mat16] proved the Σ_2^{P}-completeness of the Frobenius problem under Karp reductions. We formally review the class Σ_2^{P} in Subsection 2.2. These results suggests that the problem #NS Gaps is not as easy as $\#\mathsf{P}$.

On the other hand, Kannan [Kan92] found a polynomial-time algorithm for solving the Frobenius problem under the assumption that the number of input coprime positive integers is fixed. Barvinok and Woods [BW03] also found a polynomial-time algorithm under the same assumption. Many experimentally fast algorithms have been developed for solving the Frobenius problem; e.g., [BHNW05, ELSW07], Section 1 in [RA05]. More recently, Roune [Rou08] reported computations of the Frobenius numbers for sets of coprime positive integers of large size, each of which is thousands of digits on the bit length and is up to 13 on the number of coprime positive integers.

1.3 Complexity classes and polynomial-time reductions

In this paper, we investigate the computational complexities of #NS Gaps and its variants. In particular, we will prove those counting problems to be complete problems in a computational complexity class $\#\mathsf{NP}$ under two types of polynomial-time reductions, called parsimonious and relaxed subtractive reductions. The class $\#\mathsf{NP}$ is wider than $\#\mathsf{P}$. A relaxed subtractive reduction is a new type of reduction introducing in this paper. We describe more details of existing researches on related classes and some types of polynomial-time reductions below.

Meyer and Stockmeyer [MS72] found a hierarchy of decision problems,

called the polynomial-time hierarchy and many results have been known on this hierarchy [SU02a, SU02b, Sto76, Wra76]. We review this hierarchy formally in Section 2. Roughly speaking, the 1st level of this hierarchy is the class NP and the class of every higher level of the hierarchy is considered to be a generalization of the class NP by a relativization. This hierarchy is known to be contained by PSPACE, the class of all polynomial space computable decision problems.

Valiant [Val79a, Val79b] introduced the class $\#\mathsf{P}$ and developed the theory of the computational complexities of counting problems. Many complete problems are known for $\#\mathsf{P}$ [Val79b]. In more detail, for a problem L in NP, we verify the correctness of a witness for an instance of L and for the problem $\#L$ in $\#\mathsf{P}$, we count the number of such witnesses for L. Although $\#\mathsf{P}$ corresponds to NP, $\#\mathsf{P}$ has an interesting aspect, so called *"easy to decide but hard to count"*. There is a decision problem L in P such that the problem for counting the witnesses of a given instance of L is $\#\mathsf{P}$-complete. For example, the permanent problem[Val79a] is $\#\mathsf{P}$-complete while its decision counterpart is the bipartite perfect matching problem, which is in P. The descriptive power of $\#\mathsf{P}$ is known to be so strong. Toda proved the polynomial hierarchy to be randomized polynomial-time reducible to $\#\mathsf{P}$ [Tod91b].

On the other hand, not a few counting problems appear to be not in $\#\mathsf{P}$ and the classes wider than $\#\mathsf{P}$ have been investigated. Several types of counting complexity classes were introduced. In this paper, we use classes in the following two types of hierarchies $\#\Sigma_0^{\mathsf{P}}, \#\Sigma_1^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots, \#\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots$ [Val79a] and $\#\cdot\Sigma_0^{\mathsf{P}}, \#\cdot\Sigma_1^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots, \#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots$ [Tod91a], which are counting variants of the polynomial hierarchy. As the complement of the latter hierarchy, we also use $\#\cdot\Pi_1^{\mathsf{P}}, \#\cdot\Pi_2^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots, \#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots$. We formally define these classes in Subsection 2.2.

A counting problem $\#\cdot\Sigma_k\mathrm{SAT}$, where $k \geq 1$, is a representative of counting problems in a class wider than $\#\mathsf{P}$, which is a counting variant of the $(k+1)$-alternating quantified satisfiability problem. Moreover, $\#\cdot\Sigma_k\mathrm{SAT}$ is shown to be $\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete, for $k \geq 0$ [DHK05]. The classes of the counting version of the polynomial hierarchy are sensitive for which reduction we adopt. A parsimonious reduction is a polynomial-time reduction such that there is one-to-one correspondence between all witnesses of any instance of the problem that is reduced from and all witnesses of the constructed instance of the problem that is reduced to. Informally speaking, parsimonious reductions are weaker reductions for counting problems. If two counting problems have similar structures, then we can find a parsimonious reduction. Conversely, if we can construct a parsimonious reduction for two problems, then we have sufficiently grasped the structures of the two problems. We can observe this phenomenon from several counting problems in [Val79b]. Unfortunately, it is not easy to find a parsimonious reduction for given problems in many cases.

On the other hand, general polynomial-time Turing reductions are too strong to reduce counting problems in the following sense. Toda and Watanabe [TW92] shows that the hierarchy $\#\cdot\Sigma_0^{\mathsf{P}}, \#\cdot\Sigma_1^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots, \#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots$ is not closed under Cook reductions even if we restrict the number of its oracle calls to at most once. Durand, Hermann, and Kolaitis [DHK05] introduced subtractive reductions and found some complete counting problems in some classes in $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ under subtractive reductions. Subtractive reductions have powers stronger than parsimonious reductions but weaker than Cook reductions. Toda [Tod91a] proved that $\#\cdot\Pi_1^{\mathsf{P}} = \#\mathsf{coNP} = \#\mathsf{NP} = \#\cdot\mathsf{P}^{\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}}$. We will use this result for proving that $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ is closed under relaxed subtractive reductions in Subsection 6.1.

Schaefer [Sch78] found a dichotomy theorem for the general satisfiability problems; i.e., we can classify all general satisfiability problems into one of P and NP-complete problems by properties defined in [Sch78]. Creignou and Hermann [CH96] found the counting version of the dichotomy theorem for the general satisfiability problems, by which we can classify all the general satisfiability counting problems into one of FP and $\#\mathsf{P}$-complete problems. Moreover, Bauland, Böhler, Creignou, Reith, Schnoor, and Vollmer [BBC$^+$10] found a trichotomy for the class of counting problems, which is a generalization of the dichotomy theorem in [CH96] to the hierarchy $\#\cdot\Sigma_0^{\mathsf{P}}, \#\cdot\Sigma_1^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots, \#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots$. They introduced another type of reduction called a complementive reduction and showed the trichotomy classifying the k-alternating quantified satisfiability counting problems into three classes; FP, $\#\mathsf{P}$-complete under Cook reductions, and $\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete under complementive reductions for some $k \geq 1$. Note that, as described by the authors of [BBC$^+$10], *"the $\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-completeness under complementive reductions"* does not satisfy a more desirable condition for the completeness (Section 2.2 in [DK00]); more precisely, $\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ is not closed under complementive reductions. On the other hand,$\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ is closed under complementive reductions.

Hermann and Pichler [HP10] proved some counting problems on propositional abduction to be complete problems in some classes in the counting complexity classes in the counting hierarchies that we use in this paper. In [HP10] some of the completenesses are proved under subtractive reductions. Hermann and Pichler [HP09] also investigated some problems counting optimal solutions by using other hierarchy of the counting complexity classes $\#\cdot\mathsf{Opt}_0\mathsf{P}, \#\cdot\mathsf{Opt}_1\mathsf{P}, \cdots, \#\cdot\mathsf{Opt}_k\mathsf{P}, \cdots$. The hierarchy that Hermann and Pichler [HP09] use is an extension of the hierarchy introduced by Krentel [Kre92]. Hemaspaandra and Vollmer [HV95] surveyed researches on several counting classes wider than $\#\mathsf{P}$.

1.4 Contributions of this work

The main contribution of this work is the proof for the $\#\mathsf{NP}$-completeness of #NS Gaps under relaxed subtractive reductions. This results is also

an answer for the open problem proposed by Ramírez-Alfonsín, which is a negative answer unless $\#\mathsf{NP} = \#\mathsf{P}$. Moreover, in this paper, we formulate two counting problems #NonRep, the counting problem of computing the number of all positive integers not represented as nonnegative integer combinations of a given set of positive integers, and #Thr NS Gaps, the numerical semigroup gap counting problem with thresholds, as natural variants of #NS Gaps and show that they are $\#\mathsf{NP}$-complete under parsimonious reductions.

1.5 The organization of the paper

In Section 2, we define notions and notations for the proofs of the later sections. In Subsections 2.1 and 2.2, we define the basic notions and notations on Boolean satisfiability and classes of computational complexities, respectively. In Subsection 2.3, we introduce relaxed subtractive reductions. In Subsection 2.4, we list the formulations of related computational problems. In Subsection 2.5, we describe the $\#\mathsf{NP}$-completeness of a counting problem on Boolean satisfiability, $\# \cdot \Pi_k 1\mathrm{IN3SAT}$, under parsimonious reductions. Then, the remaining sections, we prove three variants of the numerical semigroup gap counting problem, the last one of which is the original problem proposed by Ramírez-Alfonsín and the main target of this paper. In Section 4, we prove the $\#\mathsf{NP}$-completeness of #NonRep under parsimonious reductions. In Section 5, we prove the $\#\mathsf{NP}$-completeness of #Thr NS Gaps under parsimonious reductions. In Section 6, we prove the $\#\mathsf{NP}$-completeness of #NS Gaps under relaxed subtractive reductions. Section 7 describes future work and concluding remarks.

2 Preliminaries

We denote the sets of all nonnegative integers and all positive integers by $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N}_+$, respectively. For any two nonnegative integers a and b with $a \leq b$, we denote the interval $\{c \in \mathbb{N} \colon a \leq c \leq b\}$ by $[a, b]$. For an integer k, we denote the set $\{c \in \mathbb{N} \colon c \geq k\}$ by $[k, \infty]$. In this paper, for any integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$, we consider a nonnegative integer combination $\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i a_i$ to be the sum of integers $a_{i_1}, \cdots, a_{i_l}$, where $c_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_l \leq n$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we denote the number of 1s in the binary representation of n by $\#_1(n)$.

In Section 1, for a finite set A of coprime positive integers, we defined $\mathcal{S}(A)$ as the numerical semigroup, and defined $N(A)$ as the set of all gaps of $\mathcal{S}(A)$. We extend these notations to any set of positive integers as follow. For any finite set A of positive integers, we denote the set $\{\sum_{a \in A} c_a a \colon c_a \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by $\mathcal{S}(A)$, and the set $\mathbb{N} \backslash \mathcal{S}(A)$ by $N(A)$. Needless to say, if $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ are not coprime integers, then $\mathcal{S}(\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\})$ is not a numerical semigroup. We identify an integer as its binary representation if no confusion arises.

We denote a characteristic function on a predicate p by $[\![p]\!]$; i.e., $[\![p]\!]$ is 1 if $p = 1$; and 0 otherwise. The notation $[\![\cdot]\!]$ was introduced by Kenneth E. Iverson, and often called *"Iverson bracket"* (Section 2.1 in [GKP94]). This notations is concise and thus often convenient.

2.1 Notions, notations, and assumptions on Boolean formulae

In this subsection, we define notions and notations on Boolean formulae that we use in this paper. The reader is referred to chapter 4 in [Pap94] for the details. Let φ be a CNF formula over a variable set X. If Z is a subset of X, then we denote the set of all variables in Z, occurring in φ, by Z_φ. Moreover, we denote the set of all clauses in φ by $\mathcal{C}_\varphi$. For any Boolean variable z, we denote either z or $\neg z$ by $\tilde{z}$. For any variable set Z, we denote the set of all literals $\tilde{z}$ such that $z \in Z$ by $\tilde{Z}$. For any literal $\tilde{z}$, we denote the complement of $\tilde{z}$ by $\tilde{z}^{\mathrm{c}}$. For any formula φ and assignment σ, we denote the set of all literals l in φ such that $l(\sigma) = 1$ by $T(\varphi, \sigma)$. For any assignment σ, we call a literal l a *true* literal if $l(\sigma) = 1$; and a *false* literal otherwise. For any Boolean formula φ over a variable set X, we define the size of φ as the number of occurrences of literals in φ.

Let φ be a Boolean formula. Throughout the paper, we assume $|X_\varphi| \geq 2$ and $|\mathcal{C}_\varphi| \geq 2$. Furthermore, every clause $C \in \mathcal{C}_\varphi$ does not include at most one literal for every variable. By these assumptions, we do not lose the generality.

2.2 Complexity classes and hierarchies

In this paper, we assume that the reader is familiar with basic notions and results on the computational complexity theory [AB09, DK00, Pap94]. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of decision problems. Let L be a decision problem in $\mathcal{C}$. Let $\{0,1\}$ be the alphabet of L. We denote the underlying binary relation of L by R_L; i.e., R_L is a polynomially balanced binary relation such that a pair (u, v) is in R_L if and only if v is a witness of u in L. For every instance u of L, we denote the set of all witnesses by $W_L(u)$. Let f be a function from $\{0,1\}^*$ to $\mathbb{N}$ such that $f(u) = |W_L(u)|$ for every $u \in \{0,1\}^*$. Then we call f the counting problem for L and denote it by $\#L$. We denote the class $\bigcup_{R_L \in \mathcal{C}} \#L$ of counting problems by $\#\cdot\mathcal{C}$.

We define an oracle machine M^A as a Turing machine with an oracle A. We denote the problem that an oracle machine M^A accepts by $L(M^A)$. We denote a problem L by L^A if there is an oracle machine M^A such that $L(M^A) = L$. We consider $M^\emptyset$ and $L^\emptyset$ to be M and L, respectively. If $\mathcal{B}$ is a class of decision problems and A is a decision problem, then we denote the class $\bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B^A$ by $\mathcal{B}^A$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a class of decision problems, then we denote the class $\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \#(\mathsf{NP}^A)$ by $\#\mathcal{A}$. Note that for any class $\mathcal{C}$, if $co\mathcal{C}$ is the

complement of $\mathcal{C}$, then $\#co\mathcal{C} = \#\mathcal{C}$ by definition. If $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are classes of decision problems, then we denote the class $\bigcup_{A\in\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{B}^A$ by $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{A}}$.

We define the polynomial hierarchy [Sto76] inductively as follows. Σ_0^{P} is the class P. For any $k \geq 1$, Σ_k^{P} is the class $\mathsf{NP}^{\Sigma_{k-1}^{\mathsf{P}}}$. For every $k \geq 0$, Π_k^{P} denotes the class of the complement problems of all problems in Σ_k^{P}. By definition, the classes Σ_2^{P} and Π_2^{P} are identical to NP and coNP, respectively. The polynomial hierarchy has other characterizations. We can characterize the polynomial-hierarchy by polynomially balanced binary relations [Wra76]. Let $k \geq 1$. A decision problem L is in Σ_k^{P} if and only if its underlying binary relation R_L is in Π_{k-1}^{P}. The other characterization of the polynomial hierarchy is by k-alternating Turing machines [CKS81]. In this paper, we use the machine-based definition and the predicate-based definition as its characterizations. We adopt a notation for denoting decision problems in the polynomial hierarchy. Let L be a decision problem. We define $\Sigma_k L$ and $\Pi_k L$ inductively as follow. $\Sigma_1 L$ is L. For every $k \geq 2$, $\Sigma_k L$ is a problem such that its underlying binary relation is $\Pi_{k-1} L$. For every $k \geq 1$, $\Pi_k L$ is the complement of $\Sigma_k L$.

For a decision problem in the polynomial-time hierarchy, another type of counting problem has been formulated [BBC$^+$10, DHK05]. Let L be a decision problem. We denote the following counting problems f_1 and f_2 by $\#\cdot\Sigma_k L$ and $\#\cdot\Pi_k L$, respectively. For a given $w \in \{0,1\}^*$, $f_1(w) = |W_K(w)|$ and $f_2(w) = |W_J(w)|$, where $R_K = \Sigma_k L$ and $R_J = \Pi_k L$. Note that the decision counterpart of $\#\cdot\Pi_{k-1} L$ is $\Sigma_k L$ while the decision counterpart of $\#\Sigma_k L$ is $\Sigma_k L$.

By the definitions of the polynomial hierarchy and $\#\cdot\mathcal{C}$ for some class $\mathcal{C}$ of decision problems, we immediately obtain the definition of the hierarchy of the counting complexity classes $\#\cdot\Sigma_0^{\mathsf{P}}, \#\cdot\Sigma_1^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots, \#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots$ and its complementive hierarchy $\#\cdot\Pi_0^{\mathsf{P}}, \#\cdot\Pi_1^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots, \#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}, \cdots$.

2.3 Relaxed subtractive reductions and its special cases

Durand, Hermann, and Kolaitis [DHK05] introduced subtractive reductions and found some complete problems on counting under this reductions [DHK05]. We introduce a new type of reduction by generalizing subtractive reductions.

Definition 1. *Let A and B be decision problems over $\{0,1\}$, respectively. We define a strong relaxed subtractive reduction from $\#A$ to $\#B$ as a pair (t_0, t_1), where t_0, t_1 are polynomial-time computable functions from $\{0,1\}^*$ to $\{0,1\}^*$, which satisfy the following. There is a polynomially balanced binary relation $R_F \subset \{0,1\}^* \times \{0,1\}^*$ such that $\#F \in \mathsf{FP}$ and for any $w \in \{0,1\}^*$,*

1. *$W_F(w) \subseteq W_B(t_0(w))$,*
2. *$W_B(t_1(w)) \subseteq W_B(t_0(w))$,*

3. $W_B(t_1(w)) \cap W_F(w) = \emptyset$,

4. $|W_A(w)| = |W_B(t_0(w))| - |W_B(t_1(w))| - |W_F(w)|$.

Figure 1 illustrates an Euler diagram for three related sets in a strong relaxed subtractive reduction. Let K and L be problems. Let ξ reduction be a type of polynomial-time reduction. Then, we say that K is ξ *reducible* to L if there is a ξ reduction from K to L. We call a relation R the ξ *reducibility* if R consists of all pairs (K, L) such that K is ξ reducible to L.



Figure 1: An Euler diagram for a strong relaxed subtractive reduction

Definition 2. *We call the reflexive transitive relation of strong relaxed subtractive reducibility the relaxed subtractive reducibility; i.e., we call a sequence* (t_{00}, t_{01}), $(t_{10}, t_{11}), \cdots,$ (t_{n0}, t_{n1}) *of strong subtractive reductions a relaxed subtractive reduction.*

Let A, B, (t_0, t_1), and F be defined as in Definition 1. We call (t_0, t_1) a *strong subtractive reduction* if $W_F(w) = \emptyset$ for every $w \in \{0,1\}^*$. Similarly, we define *subtractive reductions*. We call (t_0, t_1) a *parsimonious reduction* if $t_1(w) = W_F(w) = \emptyset$ for every $w \in \{0,1\}^*$. We usually denote a parsimonious reduction (t_0, t_1) by simply t_0. Parsimonious reductions have the following significant property for discussing the completenesses for classes $\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ and $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$.

Theorem 3 ([BBC+10, DHK05])**.** *The classes* $\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ *and* $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ *are closed under parsimonious reductions.*

2.4 Related computational problems

For convenience, we summarize the computational problems that we describe in this paper.

2.4.1 Decision problems

Problem 4 (NS Gaps)**.**
Input. *A set A of coprime positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$.*
Question. *Is there a gap of $\mathcal{S}(A)$?*
Comment. *This problem is trivial since the answer is always "Yes".*

Problem 5 (Thr NS Gaps)**.**
Input. *A pair (A, κ), where A is a set of coprime positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$, and $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$.*
Question. *Is there an integer in $N(A) \cap [\kappa, \infty]$?*
Comment. *"Thr" is an abbreviation for "threshold".*

Problem 6 (NonRep)**.**
Input. *A pair $(A, [\kappa_0, \kappa_1])$, where A is a set of positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$, and $\kappa_0, \kappa_1 \in \mathbb{N}$.*
Question. *Is there an integer in $N(A) \cap [\kappa_0, \kappa_1]$?*
Comment. *"NonRep" is an abbreviation for "nonrepresentable".*

As a comprehensive survey of the decision problems in the 2nd and 3rd levels of the polynomial hierarchy and the results on them, we can refer an article due to Marcus Schäfer and Umans [SU02a, SU02b].

2.4.2 Counting problems

Problem 7 (#NS Gaps)**.**
Input. *A set A of coprime positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$.*
Output. *$|N(A)|$; i.e., the number of gaps of $\mathcal{S}(A)$.*

Problem 8 (#Thr NS Gaps)**.**
Input. *A pair (A, κ), where A is a set of coprime positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$, and $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$.*
Output. *$|N(A) \cap [\kappa, \infty]|$; i.e., the number of gaps of $\mathcal{S}(A)$, which is greater than or equal to κ.*
Comment. *"Thr" is an abbreviation for "threshold".*

Problem 9 (#NonRep)**.**
Input. *A pair $(A, [\kappa_0, \kappa_1])$, where A is a set of positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ such that $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$, and $\kappa_0, \kappa_1 \in \mathbb{N}$.*
Output. *$|N(A) \cap [\kappa_0, \kappa_1]|$; i.e., the number of gaps of $\mathcal{S}(A)$ in $[\kappa_0, \kappa_1]$.*
Comment. *"Int" is an abbreviation for "nonrepresentable".*

To formulate related counting problems on Boolean satisfiability, we define two sets Φ and $\Phi_{1/3}$ as follows.

Definition 10. *Φ is a set such that for any $k \geq 0$, any CNF-formula φ, and any truth assignment σ, $(k, \varphi, \sigma) \in \Phi$ if and only if k is even and $|C_\alpha \cap T(\varphi, \sigma)| \neq 0$ for every $1 \leq \alpha \leq m$ or k is odd and $|C_\alpha \cap T(\varphi, \sigma)| = 0$ for some $1 \leq \alpha \leq m$, where $\varphi = C_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge C_m$.*

Definition 11. *$\Phi_{1/3}$ is a set such that for any $k \geq 0$, any CNF-formula φ, and any truth assignment σ, $(k, \varphi, \sigma) \in \Phi_{1/3}$ if and only if k is even and $|C_\alpha \cap T(\varphi, \sigma)| = 1$ for every $1 \leq \alpha \leq m$ or k is odd and $|C_\alpha \cap T(\varphi, \sigma)| \neq 1$ for some $1 \leq \alpha \leq m$, where $\varphi = C_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge C_m$.*

Each of the following four problems is a family of problems; i.e., one for each value of k.

Problem 12 ($\# \cdot \Sigma_k\mathrm{SAT}$, $k \geq 0$)**.**
Input. *A CNF formula φ over disjoint sets $X, X_1, \cdots, X_k$.*
Output. *$|\{\sigma \in \{0,1\}^{|X_\varphi|} : \exists\sigma_1 \forall\sigma_2 \cdots Q\sigma_k[(k, \varphi, \sigma\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) \in \Phi]\}|$, where σ_i is a partial assignment for $X_{i,\varphi}$ for every i with $1 \leq i \leq k$.*
Comment. *It is known to be $\# \cdot \Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete under parsimonious reductions [DHK05].*
Note. *We identify the problem $\# \cdot \Sigma_0\mathrm{SAT}$ as $\#\mathrm{SAT}$.*

Problem 13 ($\# \cdot \Pi_k\mathrm{SAT}$, $k \geq 1$)**.**
Input. *A CNF formula φ over disjoint sets $X, X_1, \cdots, X_k$.*
Output. *$|\{\sigma \in \{0,1\}^{|X_\varphi|} : \forall\sigma_1 \exists\sigma_2 \cdots Q\sigma_k[(k, \varphi, \sigma\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) \notin \Phi]\}|$, where σ_i is a partial assignment for $X_{i,\varphi}$ for every i with $1 \leq i \leq k$.*
Comment. *It is known to be $\# \cdot \Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete under parsimonious reductions [DHK05].*

Problem 14 ($\# \cdot \Sigma_k\mathrm{1IN3SAT}$, $k \geq 0$)**.**
Input. *A 3-CNF formula φ over disjoint sets $X, X_1, \cdots, X_k$.*
Output. *$|\{\sigma \in \{0,1\}^{|X_\varphi|} : \exists\sigma_1 \forall\sigma_2 \cdots Q\sigma_k[(k, \varphi, \sigma\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) \in \Phi_{1/3}]\}|$, where σ_i is a partial assignment for $X_{i,\varphi}$ for every i with $1 \leq i \leq k$.*
Note. *We identify the problem $\# \cdot \Sigma_0\mathrm{1IN3SAT}$ as $\#\mathrm{1IN3SAT}$.*

Problem 15 ($\# \cdot \Pi_k\mathrm{1IN3SAT}$, $k \geq 1$)**.**
Input. *A 3-CNF formula φ over disjoint sets $X, X_1, \cdots, X_k$.*
Output. *$|\{\sigma \in \{0,1\}^{|X_\varphi|} : \forall\sigma_1 \exists\sigma_2 \cdots Q\sigma_k[(k, \varphi, \sigma\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) \notin \Phi_{1/3}]\}|$, where σ_i is a partial assignment for $X_{i,\varphi}$ for every i with $1 \leq i \leq k$.*

Example 16. *Let φ_1 be a 3-CNF formula $C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge C_3 \wedge C_4$ over disjoint variable sets X and Y, where $C_1 = \neg \vee x_1 \vee x_2 \vee y_1$, $C_2 = x_1 \vee x_3 \vee \neg y_2$, $C_3 = \neg x_2 \vee x_4 \vee \neg y_3$, $C_4 = x_4 \vee y_2 \vee y_3$, $X_{\varphi_1} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ and $Y_{\varphi_1} = \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$. We can check the values of each assignment in Table 1. In the case that $\sigma_x = 0000$, if we let σ_y be 001, then exactly one literal is 1 in every clause. Similarly, in the case that $\sigma_x = 1100$, if we let σ_y be 010, then exactly one literal is 1 in every clause. However, if σ_x is one of the other*

X-assignments, no Y-assignment exists such that exactly one literal is 1 *in every clause. Thus, by Table 1, we can observe that* $\#\cdot\Pi_1$1IN3SAT(φ_1) *is* 14*; and moreover,* φ_1 *is an yes-instance of* $\Sigma_2$1IN3SAT*.*

Table 1: Clauses in φ_1, each of which contains exactly one true literal, where each cell corresponds to an assignment and contains indices of clauses.

σ_x	σ_y							
	000	100	010	001	110	101	011	111
0000	1, 2	2	1, 4	1, 2, 3, 4	4	2, 3, 4	1, 3	3
1000	—	1	2, 4	3, 4	1, 2, 4	1, 3, 4	2, 3	1, 2, 3
0100	2, 3	2, 3	3, 4	2, 4	3, 4	2, 4	—	—
0010	1	—	1, 2, 4	1, 3, 4	2, 4	3, 4	1, 2, 3	2, 3
0001	1, 2, 4	2, 4	1	1, 2	—	2	1	—
1100	1, 3	3	1, 2, 3, 4	1, 4	2, 3, 4	4	1, 2	2
1010	—	1	4	3, 4	1, 4	1, 3, 4	3	1, 3
1001	4	1, 4	2	—	1, 2	1	2	1, 2
0110	3	3	2, 3, 4	4	2, 3, 4	4	2	2
0101	2, 4	2, 4	—	2, 3	—	2, 3	3	3
0011	1, 4	4	1, 2	1	2	—	1, 2	2
1110	1, 3	3	1, 3, 4	1, 4	3, 4	4	1	—
1101	1, 4	4	1, 2	1, 3	2	3	1, 2, 3	2, 3
1011	4	1, 4	—	—	1	1	—	1
0111	4	4	2	3	2	3	2, 3	2, 3
1111	1, 4	4	1	1, 3	—	3	1, 3	3

We summarize the relations between decision problems and their counting problems and their complexity classes in Table 2.

2.5 The complexities of $\#\Sigma_k$1IN3SAT and $\#\Pi_k$1IN3SAT

In this section, we describe the $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-completeness of $\#\Pi_k$1IN3SAT. This statement is equivalent to Lemma 5.5 in Bauland et al. [BBC$^+$10] and they proved it by using a theory for constraints satisfaction problems, which is a more general tool for investigating satisfiability problems than the one in this paper. For readability, we give a slightly weaker but more intuitive and elementary proof. The reduction in the following proof is a folklore, although any explicit literature has not been published, to the author's best knowledge.

Theorem 17. $\#\cdot\Sigma_k$1IN3SAT *is* $\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$*-complete under parsimonious reductions for every* $k \geq 0$*.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.1 in [DHK05], $\#\cdot\Sigma_k$SAT is $\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete under parsimonious reductions. Moreover, since $\#\cdot\Sigma_k$1IN3SAT is a special case

Table 2: Complexities of related decision and counting problems.

Counting problems	Known hardest classes (reduction types)	Decision problems
#SAT	#P-complete (parsimonious) [Val79a]	SAT
$\#\cdot\Sigma_1$SAT	#NP-complete (parsimonious) [DHK05]	
$\#\cdot\Pi_{k-1}$SAT	$\#\cdot\Pi_{k-1}^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete (parsimonious) [DHK05]	Σ_kSAT
$\#\cdot\Sigma_k$SAT	$\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete (parsimonious) [DHK05]	
$\#\cdot$1IN3SAT	#P-complete (parsimonious)	1IN3SAT
$\#\cdot\Sigma_1$1IN3SAT	#NP-complete (parsimonious)	
$\#\cdot\Pi_{k-1}$1IN3SAT	$\#\cdot\Pi_{k-1}^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete (parsimonious)	Σ_k1IN3SAT
$\#\cdot\Sigma_k$1IN3SAT	$\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete (parsimonious)	
#NonRep	#NP-complete (parsimonious) [this work]	NonRep
#Thr NS Gaps	#NP-complete (parsimonious) [this work]	Thr NS Gaps
#NS Gaps	#NP-complete (relaxed subtractive) [this work]	NS Gaps

Table 3: All satisfying assignments for the constructed formula φ'_C from a clause in the proof for Theorem 17.

$\tilde{z}_1$	$\tilde{z}_2$	$\tilde{z}_3$	$\langle C\rangle_1$	$\langle C\rangle_2$	$\langle C\rangle_3$	$\langle C\rangle_4$	$\langle C\rangle_5$	$\langle C\rangle_6$	$\langle C\rangle_7$	$\langle C\rangle_8$	$\langle C\rangle_9$
0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1

of $\#\cdot\Sigma_k$SAT, the problem $\#\cdot\Sigma_k$1IN3SAT is in $\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$. Thus, it suffices to show that $\#\cdot\Sigma_k$SAT is parsimonious reducible to $\#\cdot\Sigma_k$1IN3SAT. Let φ be a 3-CNF formula over disjoint variable sets $X, Y_1, \cdots, Y_{k-1}$. We denote the set $X \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} Y_i$ by Z. We will define a set V of new variables and then construct a 3-CNF formula φ' such that

$$\begin{aligned}&|\{\sigma' \in \{0,1\}^{|X_\varphi \cup V|} \colon \exists\sigma'_1 \forall\sigma'_2 \cdots Q\sigma'_{k-1}[(k, \varphi', \sigma'\sigma'_1 \cdots \sigma'_{k-1}) \in \Phi_{1/3}]\}|\\ &= |\{\sigma \in \{0,1\}^{|X_\varphi|} \colon \exists\sigma_1 \forall\sigma_2 \cdots Q\sigma_{k-1}[(k, \varphi, \sigma\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{k-1}) \in \Phi]\}|,\end{aligned}$$

where σ_i and σ'_i denote partial assignments for X_i for every i with $1 \le i \le k-1$.

Let C be any clause $\tilde{z}_1 \vee \tilde{z}_2 \vee \tilde{z}_3$ in φ, where $\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2$, and $\tilde{z}_3$ are literals over $X \cup V \cup Z$. We define $\langle C\rangle_1, \cdots, \langle C\rangle_9$ as new variables. Then we define a 3-CNF formula φ'_C as the conjunction of clauses

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{z}_1 \vee \langle C\rangle_1 \vee \langle C\rangle_2, \quad \tilde{z}_2 \vee \langle C\rangle_3 \vee \langle C\rangle_2, \quad \langle C\rangle_1 \vee \langle C\rangle_3 \vee \langle C\rangle_4, \quad \tilde{z}_3 \vee \langle C\rangle_5 \vee \langle C\rangle_6,\\ &\tilde{z}_3 \vee \langle C\rangle_7 \vee \langle C\rangle_6, \quad \langle C\rangle_5 \vee \langle C\rangle_7 \vee \langle C\rangle_8, \quad \langle C\rangle_2 \vee \langle C\rangle_6 \vee \langle C\rangle_9.\end{aligned}$$

Table 3 illustrates all satisfying assignments for φ'_C. We define V as the set

$$\{\langle C\rangle_i \colon C \text{ is a clause in } \varphi, 1 \le i \le 9\}.$$

Finally, we define φ' as the conjunction of φ'_C for all clauses C in φ.

We can check the following statement. For every assignments $\sigma \in \{0,1\}^{|X_\varphi|}$ and $\delta \in \{0,1\}^{|Z|}$, if $(k, \varphi, \sigma\delta) \in \Phi$ then there is exactly one $\sigma' \in \{0,1\}^{|X_\varphi \cup V|}$ such that $(k, \varphi, \sigma'\delta) \in \Phi_{1/3}$. Moreover, we can check the statement of the converse direction. We can construct φ' in polynomial time since we construct 9 variables and a formula of 7 clauses for every clause in a given φ. □

Durand, Hermann, and Kolaitis [DHK05] state the $\#\cdot\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-completeness under parsimonious reductions explicitly without proofs. As they described in the paper [DHK05], the proof for the statement is due to Wrathall [Wra76]. Although the proof in [Wra76] is for the Σ_k^{P}-completenesses of Σ_kSAT, the

reduction is parsimonious. Du and Ko (Theorem 3.13 in [DK00]) also give a more concise proof for the same statement.

By the proof for Theorem 17, we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 18. *$\#\cdot\Pi_k$1IN3SAT is $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete under parsimonious reductions for every $k \geq 1$.*

3 Overview of three versions of the numerical semigroup gap counting problem

By definition, #NonRep is a generalization of #Thr NS Gaps and #Thr NS Gaps is a generalization of #NS Gaps. We can give a formal validity of this relation. Given a set A of coprime positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ with $2 \leq a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ and $n \geq 2$, the Frobenius number $g(A)$ is known to be smaller than a_n^2 [Wil78]. Since $g(A)$ is the largest element of $N(A)$ and $N(A)$ consists of only positive integers, the cardinality of $N(A)$ is less than a_n^2. For example, if $a_1 = 12, a_2 = 19, a_3 = 51, a_4 = 53$ and $A = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$, then $|N(A)| = 60$, $g(A) = 109$, and $a_4^2 = 2809$. Thus, we consider an instance (A, λ) of #Thr NS Gaps to be an instance $(A, [\lambda, a_n^2])$ of #NonRep; and an instance A of #NS Gaps to be an instance $(A, 1)$ of #Thr NS Gaps. Thus, the hardnesses of three problems are

$$\#\text{NS Gaps}, \quad \#\text{Thr NS Gaps}, \quad \#\text{NonRep}$$

in the order from the weakest one.

On the other hand, intuitively speaking, the difficulties of the reductions from $\#\cdot\Pi_1$1IN3SAT appear to be in the reverse order for the difficulties of the problems in themselves. #NonRep has a structure that is the most similar to $\#\cdot\Pi_1$1IN3SAT among the three problems; #Thr NS Gaps is the 2nd similar one; and #NS Gaps has a structure that is the farthest to $\#\cdot\Pi_1$1IN3SAT. We remark the following elementary fact. We use the property of Remark 19 in Sections 5 and 6, implicitly.

Remark 19. *If A_1 and A_2 are sets of coprime positive integers such that $A_1 \subseteq A_2$, then $N(A_2) \subseteq N(A_1)$.*

We use a common approach to prove the #NP-completenesses of #NonRep, #Thr NS Gaps, and #NS Gaps. The bases of the reductions originates from the proof for Theorem 9.10 in [Pap94]. In Section 5, we will extend the reduction of Section 4. Moreover, in Section 6, we will extend the reduction of Section 5.

4 The complexity of #NonRep

In this section, we investigate the complexity of the problem #NonRep. In particular, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 20. #NonRep *is* #NP*-complete under parsimonious reductions.*

4.1 Ideas of the proof

In this subsection, we describe the idea of our proof for Theorem 20. We can easily check the membership of #NonRep for #NP. Thus, the main part of the proof is for the hardness of #NonRep. We will prove this theorem by constructing a relaxed subtractive reduction from $\# \cdot \Pi_1 1\text{IN3SAT}$ to #NonRep in Subsection 4.2. We describe the reduction intuitively and illustrate an example below.

Let φ be a 3-CNF formula over $X \cup Y$. To simulate the behavior of φ, we define a positive integer for each pair of a truth assignment and a Boolean variable. Let β be the binary representation of an integer e that we construct. We consider the binary representation β to be partitioned into 5 types of subrepresentations by the purposes. We explain the 5 types in the order from the smaller bits. The 1st type is for simulating an assignment for a variable in X. The 2nd and the 3rd types are for simulating which variable in X and Y we assign a Boolean value to, respectively. The 4th type is for simulating which clause we assign 1 to a literal in. The 5th is introduced for a purpose not for directly simulating a truth assignment for φ, which we describe the below.



Figure 2: The structure of the binary representation of a constructed integer from a 3-CNF formula.

Each type of subrepresentation is allocated to a fixed range of positions, which depends on φ. Figure 2 illustrates the binary representation of a constructed integer. In Figure 2, each of the 5 types of subrepresentations is distinguished by different shading of gray. For a technical reason, the 2nd to the 4th types of subrepresentations have copies of them; in more

detail, such copies are not for the proof for Theorem 20 but for the proofs of Theorems 25 and 30.

Furthermore, β are refined into 8 parts. We give each subrepresentation a name as in Figure 2, which are *1S*, *C2*, *C1*, *Y2*, *Y1*, *X2* and *X1* parts in the descending order from the highest bits.

We describe more details of the structure of an integer we will construct. Let $x_1, \cdots, x_{k_1}$ and $y_1, \cdots, y_{k_2}$ denote all variables in X and Y, occurring in φ, respectively. Let $C_1, \cdots, C_{k_3}$ be all clauses in φ. Every constructed integer is represented with $3k_1 + 2k_2 + 2k_3 + \lfloor \log(3k_1 + 2k_2 + 2k_3) \rfloor + 1$ bits. As illustrated in Figure 2, k_1 is the number of variables in X, occurring in φ, and is equal to the bit length of each of the *X1* and *X2* parts. Similarly, k_2 is the number of variables in Y, occurring in φ, and equal to the bit length of each of the *Y1* and *Y2* parts. Moreover, the number k_3 of clauses in φ is equal to the bit length of each of the *C1* and *C2* parts. For example, we will construct integers from the formula φ_1 in Example 16. Table 4 illustrates the list of all integers constructed by the reduction from φ_1. In Table 4, we use two different positional notations; i.e. we denote the *1S* part as the decimal representation and the other parts as the binary representation, which reflect the role of each part.

Table 4: Integers constructed from $\varphi_1 = C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge C_3 \wedge C_4$, where $C_1 = \neg x_1 \vee x_2 \vee y_1$, $C_2 = x_1 \vee x_3 \vee \neg y_2$, $C_3 = \neg x_2 \vee x_4 \vee \neg y_3$, $C_4 = x_4 \vee y_2 \vee y_3$.

Variables	Assigned values	Constructed integers							
		1S	*C2*	*C1*	*Y2*	*Y1*	*X2*	*X1*	*XA*
x_1	1	5	0010	0010	000	000	0001	0001	0001
x_1	0	5	0001	0001	000	000	0001	0001	0000
x_2	1	5	0001	0001	000	000	0010	0010	0010
x_2	0	5	0100	0100	000	000	0010	0010	0000
x_3	1	5	0010	0010	000	000	0100	0100	0100
x_3	0	3	0000	0000	000	000	0100	0100	0000
x_4	1	7	1100	1100	000	000	1000	1000	1000
x_4	0	3	1100	1100	000	000	1000	1000	0000
y_1	1	4	0001	0001	001	001	0000	0000	0000
y_1	0	2	0000	0000	001	001	0000	0000	0000
y_2	1	4	1000	1000	010	010	0000	0000	0000
y_2	0	4	0010	0010	010	010	0000	0000	0000
y_3	1	4	1000	1000	100	100	0000	0000	0000
y_3	0	4	0100	0100	100	100	0000	0000	0000

We describe the detail of the simulation of each part of a binary representation. A constructed integer corresponds to a Boolean variable assigned

a Boolean value. We first consider e to be the integer for simulating $x_i \in X$ assigned to 1 and describe how β simulates it, where $1 \leq i \leq k_1$. In the *XA* part, we set the i-th bit to 1 and the other bits to 0. This means that x_i is assigned 1. In each of the *X1* and *X2* parts, we set the i-th bit to 1 and the other bits to 0. This means that x_i is assigned a Boolean value. In each of the *Y1* and *Y2* parts, we set every bit to 0 since we construct the integer e for simulating the behavior of a variable in X. Moreover, in each of the *C1* and *C2* parts, for every $1 \leq j \leq k_3$, we set the j-th bit to 1 if the clause C_j includes the literal x_i; and the other bits to 0 otherwise. Let v be the binary representation of an integer $3l_1 + 2l_2 + 2l_3$ such that l_1, l_2, and l_3 are the numbers of 1s, occurring in the *X1*, *Y1*, and *C1* parts, respectively. We allocate v to the *1S* part of β.

Next, we consider e to be constructed for simulating the assignment of 0 to x_i. The *X1*, *X2*, *Y1*, and *Y2* parts are constructed in the same way as in the simulation of the assignment of 1 to x_i. In each of the *C1* and *C2* parts, for every $1 \leq j \leq k_3$, we set the j-th bit to 1 if the clause C_j includes the literal $\neg x_i$; and the other bits to 0 otherwise. We set every bit of the *XA* part to 0. In the case that e is for the simulation of an assignment to a variable in Y, we can construct it in the same way as for a variable in X.

As we described above, we simulate an assignment to a variable in φ by using an integer. Thus, if we select one of two integers for every variable, then we can simulate an assignment to all variables in φ as the sum of $(k_1 + k_2)$ integers. Let ν be the sum of such $(k_1 + k_2)$ integers. Then, every bit in the *X1*, *X2*, *Y1*, and *Y2* parts is 1. Moreover, the *1S* part represents the sum of l_1 and l_2 such that l_1 is the number of 1s in the *X1*, *X2*, *Y1*, *Y2*, *C1*, and *C2* parts, and l_2 is equal to the number of 1s in the *X1* part. The number l_2 means the number of variables that are assigned values. Every bit in the *XA* part takes the same value as the value assigned the corresponding variable in X. Moreover, if exactly one true literal is assigned 1 in every clause, then every bit in the *C1* and *C2* parts is 1. Consequently, for any X-assignment σ_x, if there is a Y-assignment σ_y such that exactly one true literal exists in every clause, then the assignment $\sigma_x\sigma_y$ is simulated as an integer in the interval $[\lambda, \mu]$ in Figure 3.

The above discussion guarantees that we can simulate all assignments for φ if we correctly select one of the corresponding two integers once for every variable in X and Y. On the other hand, the reverse direction is not so easy to observe; i.e., it is more difficult to verify whether we have selected one of the corresponding two integers exactly once for every variable since, in #NonRep, we can repeatedly select every given positive integer. Moreover, for a variable z, the two integers constructed for the pair of z and 0 and the pair of z and 1 may be simultaneously selected. Another awkward phenomenon is carrying over during the additions of the integers that we select. Overcoming these difficulties motivates the introduction of the *1S* part.



Figure 3: The interval $[\lambda, \mu]$ that simulates assignments in φ.

In Table 4, we can check that for any pair (σ_x, σ_y) of an X-assignment $\sigma_x \in \{0,1\}^4$ and a Y-assignment $\sigma_y \in \{0,1\}^3$, every clause of φ_1 includes exactly one true literal if and only if the sum of selected integers is in the interval $[\lambda, \mu]$ in Figure 3.

4.2 A formal discussion for Theorem 20

Proof of Theorem 20. We first show that #NonRep is in #NP. Since $\#\mathsf{NP} = \# \cdot \Pi_1^{\mathsf{P}}$ [Tod91a], we may prove the membership of #NonRep for $\# \cdot \Pi_1^{\mathsf{P}}$. Let $(A, [\kappa_0, \kappa_1])$ be an instance of #NonRep. Let M^L be an oracle machine, where L is the decision version of the integer knapsack problem. This problem was proved to be NP-complete (Section 15.7 in [PS82]). First M^L guesses a gap e of $\mathcal{S}(\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\})$ in the interval $[\kappa_0, \kappa_1]$. Then, M^L verifies e to be in $N(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \cap [\kappa_0, \kappa_1]$ by using oracle L. Consequently, #NonRep is in $\# \cdot \Pi_1^{\mathsf{P}}$.

In the rest of the proof, we show that #NonRep is #NP-hard under parsimonious reductions by reducing $\# \cdot \Pi_1$1IN3SAT to #NonRep. In particular, we construct a polynomial-time computable one to one function s as a parsimonious reduction. We fix φ to be a 3-CNF formula over $X \cup Y$ and define $s(\varphi)$, where $X \cap Y = \emptyset$.

Let k_1 and k_2 denote the numbers of variables in X and Y, occurring in φ, respectively. Let $C_1, \cdots, C_{k_3}$ be all clauses of φ. Recall that we assumed k_3 to be larger than 1 in Subsection 2.1. We suppose that $X_\varphi = \{x_1, \cdots, x_{k_1}\}$ and $Y_\varphi = \{y_1, \cdots, y_{k_2}\}$. We will construct $(H, [\lambda, \mu])$ as an instance of #NonRep below, where H is a set of coprime positive integers and $[\lambda, \mu]$ is an interval of positive integers. Every integer in H is of the form in Figure 4.

We define d_0 as the integer $2^{3k_1+2k_2+2k_3}$. We can construct d_0 in poly-



Figure 4: A constructed integer that simulates a literal $\tilde{z}$ in a 3-CNF formula φ.

nomial time. Then, for every $\tilde{x}_i \in \tilde{X}_\varphi$, we define an integer $h(\tilde{x}_i)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} h(\tilde{x}_i) &= (|\{C_j \colon \tilde{x}_i \in C_j, 1 \le j \le k_3\}| + 3)\, d_0 \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{\tilde{x}_i \in C_j \\ 1 \le j \le k_3}} \left(2^{3k_1+2k_2+k_3+j-1} + 2^{3k_1+2k_2+j-1}\right) \\ &\quad + 2^{2k_1+i-1} + 2^{k_1+i-1} + 2^{i-1}[\![\tilde{x}_i = x_i]\!]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for every $\tilde{y}_i \in \tilde{Y}_\varphi$, we define an integer $h(\tilde{y}_i)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} h(\tilde{y}_i) &= (|\{C_j \colon \tilde{y}_i \in C_j, 1 \le j \le k_3\}| d_0 + 2)\, d_0 \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{\tilde{y}_i \in C_j \\ 1 \le j \le k_3}} \left(2^{3k_1+2k_2+k_3+j-1} + 2^{3k_1+2k_2+j-1}\right) \\ &\quad + 2^{3k_1+k_2+i-1} + 2^{3k_1+i-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We define H as $\{h(\tilde{z}) \colon \tilde{z} \in \tilde{X}_\varphi \cup \tilde{Y}_\varphi\}$. We define positive integers λ and μ as follows.

$$\lambda = (3k_1 + 2k_2 + 2k_3)d_0 + \sum_{i=k_1}^{3k_1+2k_2+2k_3-1} 2^i,$$

$$\mu = (3k_1 + 2k_2 + 2k_3)d_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{3k_1+2k_2+2k_3-1} 2^i.$$

We can construct $h(\tilde{z})$ for every literal $\tilde{z}$ in $\tilde{X}_\varphi \cup \tilde{Y}_\varphi$ in polynomial time. We define $s(\varphi)$ as $(H \cup \{d_0\}, [\lambda, \mu])$. The function s is polynomial-time computable since $|H|$ is $2(k_1 + k_2)$ and each of $H \cup \{d_0\} \cup \{\lambda, \mu\}$ can be constructed in polynomial time.

Then, we formally define the parts of the binary representation of a positive integer, which were informally described in Subsection 4.1. Let β be the binary representation of a positive integer. Then, we call the bit sequence from the 1st bit to the k_1-th bit the *XA* part of β; the sequence from the $(k_1 + 1)$-th bit to the $(2k_1)$-th bit the *X1* part of β; the sequence from the $(2k_1 + 1)$-th bit to the $(3k_1)$-th bit the *X2* part of β; the sequence from the $(3k_1 + 1)$-th bit to the $(3k_1 + k_2)$-th bit the *Y1* part of β; the sequence from the $(3k_1 + k_2 + 1)$-th bit to the $(3k_1 + 2k_2)$-th bit the *Y2* part of β; the sequence from the $(3k_1 + 2k_2 + 1)$-th bit to the $(3k_1 + 2k_2 + k_3)$-th bit the *C1* part of β; the sequence from the $(3k_1 + 2k_2 + k_3 + 1)$-th bit to the $(3k_1 + 2k_2 + 2k_3)$-th bit the *C2* part of β; and the sequence from the $(3k_1+2k_2+2k_3+1)$-th bit to the $(3k_1+2k_2+2k_3+\lfloor\log(3k_1+2k_2+2k_3)\rfloor+2)$-th bit the *1S* part of β.

We will check the validity of the above construction; i.e., we show that there is exactly one true literal in every clause in φ for a given assignment

σ if and only if there is a set $S \subseteq H \cup \{d_0\}$ such that $\sum_{\tau \in S} \tau$ is in $[\lambda, \mu]$. The *"only if"* part of this statement is straightforward by the construction. We show the *"if"* part by proving Claim 21. In the rest of the proof for Theorem 20, we fix $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_\iota$ to be positive integers in H, and α to be the sum of $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_\iota$, where $\iota \geq 1$. For every $\tilde{z} \in \tilde{X}_\varphi \cup \tilde{Y}_\varphi$, we denote the number $|\{\alpha_i \colon \alpha_i = h(\tilde{z}), 1 \leq i \leq \iota\}|$ by $c(\tilde{z})$.

Claim 21. *For every $z \in X_\varphi \cup Y_\varphi$, exactly one of the following conditions holds.*

1. $c(z) = 0$ *and* $c(\neg z) = 1$.
2. $c(z) = 1$ *and* $c(\neg z) = 0$.

To prove Claim 21, it suffices to check Claim 23 as a more general statement. As preparation, we define some notions and notations for any non-negative integer e. For each $1 \leq i \leq 3$, let $I_{i,e}$ be a set of integers in $[1, k_i]$. For each $1 \leq i \leq 3$, let $I_{0,e}$ be a subset of $I_{1,e}$. We say that e is *consistent* with φ if e can be written as

$$(3|I_{1,e}| + 2|I_{2,e}| + 2|I_{3,e}|)\, d_0 + \sum_{i \in I_{3,e}} (2^{k_3} + 1) 2^{3k_1 + 2k_2 + i - 1}$$
$$+ \sum_{i \in I_{2,e}} (2^{k_2} + 1) 2^{3k_1 + i - 1} + \sum_{i \in I_{1,e}} (2^{k_1} + 1) 2^{k_1 + i - 1} + \sum_{i \in I_{0,e}} 2^{i-1}.$$

It is noteworthy that if e is in $[\lambda, \varphi]$, then e is consistent with φ. For every $1 \leq \kappa \leq \iota$, we denote the sum $\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} e_i$ by ξ_κ. We may assume the addition of $e_1, \cdots, e_\iota$ to do in the left associative manner; i.e., $((e_1 + e_2) + \cdots + e_{\iota - 1}) + e_\iota$, without loss of generality. Claim 22 is essential although it appears to follow from the definitions of the constructed integers.

Claim 22. *ξ_i is consistent with φ for every $1 \leq i \leq \iota$ if and only if no carry occurs at the XA, X1, X2, Y1, Y2, C1, and C2 parts in the addition of ξ_{i-1} and α_i for every $2 \leq i \leq \iota$.*

Proof of Claim 22. The *"if "* part is trivial by the definitions of integers in H. Thus, we prove the *"only if"* part below. The proof is by induction on $\iota \geq 1$. Let ξ_i be consistent with φ for every $1 \leq i \leq \iota$. By induction hypothesis, no carry occurs at the *XA*, *X1*, *X2*, *Y1*, *Y2*, *C1*, and *C2* parts in the addition $\xi_{i-1} + \alpha_i$ for every $2 \leq i \leq l - 1$. On the other hand, ξ_{i-1} and ξ_i are consistent with φ and $\xi_i = \xi_{i-1} + \alpha_i$. Moreover, α_i is consistent with φ since any element of H consistent with φ. If we assume that a carry occurs at one of the the *X1*, *X2*, *Y1*, *Y2*, *C1*, and *C2* parts in the addition $\xi_{i-1} + \alpha_i$, then $\#_1(\xi_i \mod d_0)$ is smaller than the sum of $\#_1(\xi_{i-1} \mod d_0)$ and $\#_1(\alpha_i \mod d_0)$ although $\#_1(\xi_i \mod d_0)$ is equal to $\#_1(\xi_{i-1} \mod d_0) + \#_1(\alpha_i \mod d_0)$ in the case that ξ_i is consistent with φ. However,

in the addition $\xi_{i-1} + \alpha_i$, if a carry occurs only at the *XA* part, then at least two carries occur at the *X1* and *X2* parts since $I_{0,\xi_{i-1}} \subseteq I_{1,\xi_{i-1}}$ and $I_{0,\alpha_i} \subseteq I_{1,\alpha_i}$ by their consistencies. Consequently, no carry occurs at the *XA*, *X1*, *X2*, *Y1*, *Y2*, *C1*, and *C2* parts in the addition $\xi_{i-1} + \alpha_i$ for every $2 \leq i \leq l$. The proof is complete. □(Claim 22)

By Claim 22, we can prove Claim 23 by induction on ι.

Claim 23. *If α is consistent with φ, then the following statements hold.*

1. *For every $x_j \in X_\varphi$ with $1 \leq j \leq k_1$,*
   - *if $j \in I_{0,\alpha} \cap I_{1,\alpha}$, then $c(x_j) = 1$ and $c(\neg x_j) = 0$,*
   - *if $j \in I_{1,\alpha} \backslash I_{0,\alpha}$, then $c(x_j) = 0$ and $c(\neg x_j) = 1$,*
   - *otherwise $c(x_j) = c(\neg x_j) = 0$.*
2. *For every $y_j \in Y_\varphi$ with $1 \leq j \leq k_2$,*
   - *if $j \in I_{2,\alpha}$, then $c(\tilde{y}_j) = 1$ and $c(\tilde{y}_j^c) = 0$,*
   - *otherwise $c(y_j) = c(\neg y_j) = 0$.*

Finally, we check the time complexity for the construction of the function s in Claim 24.

Claim 24. *$s(\varphi)$ can be constructed in polynomial time on the size of φ.*

Proof of Claim 24. It suffices to check λ, μ, and all integers in H to be computable in time polynomial in k_1, k_2, and k_3. Let $\tilde{z}$ be a literal in $\tilde{X}_\varphi \cup \tilde{Y}_\varphi$. The integer $h(\tilde{z})$ consists of at most $3k_1+2k_2+2k_3+\lfloor \log(3k_1+2k_2+2k_3) \rfloor + 1$ bits. We can construct each of the *XA*, *X1*, *X2*, *Y1*, and *Y2* parts of $h(\tilde{z})$ in time linear in k_1, k_2 and k_3. For every clause C in φ, we can check whether $\tilde{z}$ is in C in constant polynomial. Thus, we construct the *C1* and *C2* parts of $h(\tilde{z})$ in time polynomial in k_1, k_2, and k_3. After all the parts except the *1S* part are constructed, we can count 1s in all the parts except the *1S* part in time linear in k_1, k_2, and k_3. Thus, we can calculate the *1S* part in time polynomial in k_1, k_2, and k_3. It follows that $h(\tilde{z})$ is computed in time polynomial in k_1, k_2, and k_3. The integer $h(\tilde{z})$ is calculated in time polynomial in k_1, k_2, and k_3. The set H has $2(k_1 + k_2)$ elements since an integer is defined as an element for every literal in $\tilde{X}_\varphi \cup \tilde{Y}_\varphi$. By the similar method in the above discussion, the integers λ and μ can be computed in time polynomial in k_1, k_2, and k_3. Consequently, the claim holds. □(Claim 24)

□(Theorem 25)

5 The complexity of #Thr NS Gaps

In Section 4, we proved $\# \cdot \Pi_1 1\text{IN3SAT}$ to be parsimonious reducible to #NonRep as in the proof for the hardness in Theorem 20. In this section, we prove the following theorem by extending the reduction in the proof for Theorem 20 to a reduction from $\# \cdot \Pi_1 1\text{IN3SAT}$ to #Thr NS Gaps.

Theorem 25. #Thr NS Gaps *is* #NP*-complete under parsimonious reductions.*

5.1 Ideas of the proof

In this subsection, let φ be fixed to a 3-CNF formula over $X \cup Y$, as in the proof for Theorem 20, where X and Y are disjoint. Similarly, let λ, μ, H, h, and d_0 be defined as in the proof for Theorem 20. For extending the reduction in the proof for Theorem 20 to a reduction from $\# \cdot \Pi_1 1\text{IN3SAT}$ to #Thr NS Gaps, we specify all gaps of $\mathcal{S}(H \cup \{d_0\})$ in the interval $[\lambda, \mu]$ by using another set $s_0(\varphi)$ containing H as a subset, which we will also construct from φ. In more detail, we will construct a polynomial-time computable function s_0 such that $N(H \cup \{d_0\}) \cap [\lambda, \mu] = N(s_0(\varphi)) \cap [\lambda, \infty]$.

5.1.1 Observation

First we describe how to specify every integer in $N(H \cup \{d_0\}) \cap [\lambda, \mu]$ as a gap of $\mathcal{S}(s_0(\varphi))$. For this purpose, we observe an example illustrated in Figure 5. In this figure, we consider a toy example of #NonRep instead of an input constructed from a 3-CNF formula for the simplicity of the description. In Figure 5, all the circles on three lines mean integers in $[0, 49]$. On each line, grayed circles are the input coprime positive integers. Every black circle is an integer that can be written as a nonnegative integer combination of the corresponding input coprime positive integers but is not included by the input themselves. White circle mean other integers in $[0, 49]$; i.e., integers that cannot be written as nonnegative integer combinations of the corresponding input integers. The 1st line means the gaps of the numerical semigroup generated by $S = \{8, 12, 13\}$; i.e., an instance $(\{8, 12, 13\}, [28, 31])$ of #Thr NS Gaps.

Next we will specify the two gaps 30 and 31 in $[28, 31]$ without the specification by this interval. We want to find a set B such that $N(B)$ includes all integers in $N(8, 12, 13) \cap [28, 31]$ but does not include any integer in $[28, 31] \backslash N(8, 12, 13)$. As a simple but naive approach, there is a specification of such a set B by using gaps of the numerical semigroup generated by $T = \{8, 12, 13, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39\}$. The 2nd line of Figure 5 illustrates gaps of $\mathcal{S}(T)$. The set T contains all successive integers η from 32 to 39. The number of integers in η is greater than or equal to an element 8 of S. This fact guarantees that $N(T)$ has no element greater than 31 since



Figure 5: Two approaches by $T = \{8, 12, 13, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39\}$ and $U = \{8, 12, 13, 27\}$ for simulating gaps of the numerical semigroup generated by $S = \{8, 12, 13\}$ in interval $[28, 31]$.

for any finite set L of coprime positive integers, $N(L)$ includes no successive integer sequence of length longer than the magnitude of any element of L. Unfortunately, the input size of T is of exponential order in the size of S since we assume the size of an input of #Thr NS Gaps to be its bit length.

Then, for refraining the growth of the cardinality of B, we should specify every integer between 32 and 39 as a nonnegative integer combination of a set of positive integers. Generally, it is not so difficult since we can specify every integer in an interval $[\kappa, \kappa+m-1]$ of positive integers as a nonnegative integer combination of l positive integers such that $l = O(\log m)$. However, we have to be careful to preserve all gaps of $\mathcal{S}(\{8, 12, 13\})$ between 28 and 31. If U is the set $\{8, 12, 13, 27\}$, then U satisfies such conditions. On the 3rd line of Figure 5, we can check that all integers in $N(S)$ greater than 31 are included by $N(U)$, which are 35 and 43, and $N(S)$ does not contain any gap of $\mathcal{S}(S)$ in $[28, 31]$, which are 30 and 31.

5.1.2 An example of our reduction

Next, we illustrate the reduction that we will formulate in Subsection 5.2 by using an example. Let φ_2 be a 3-CNF formula $C_1 \wedge C_2$, where $C_1 = \neg x_1 \vee x_2 \vee y_1$ and $C_2 = x_1 \vee x_2 \vee y_2$. Table 5 shows clauses each of which contains exactly one true clause for every assignment for φ_2.

Table 5: Clauses in φ_2, each of which contains exactly one true literal, where each cell contains indices of clauses for an assignment.

σ_x	σ_y			
	00	10	01	11
00	1	—	1, 2	2
10	2	1, 2	—	1
01	2	2	—	—
11	1	—	1	—

Table 6: Integers constructed from φ_2 by the method in the proof for Theorem 20.

Variables	Assigned values	Constructed integers								Decimal notations
		1S	*C2*	*C1*	*Y2*	*Y1*	*X2*	*X1*	*XA*	
x_1	1	5	10	10	00	00	01	01	01	92181
x_1	0	5	01	01	00	00	01	01	00	87060
x_2	1	7	11	11	00	00	10	10	10	130090
x_2	0	3	00	00	00	00	10	10	00	49192
y_1	1	4	01	01	01	01	00	00	00	70976
y_1	0	2	00	00	01	01	00	00	00	33088
y_2	1	4	10	10	10	10	00	00	00	76416
y_2	0	2	00	00	10	10	00	00	00	33408

Table 7: The endpoints of the interval constructed from φ_2 by the method in the proof for Theorem 20.

	Constructed integers								Decimal notations
	1S	*C2*	*C1*	*Y2*	*Y1*	*X2*	*X1*	*XA*	
λ_{φ_2}	14	11	11	11	11	11	11	00	245756
μ_{φ_2}	14	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	245759

Tables 6 and 7 show the integers and intervals constructed by using the reduction in the proof for Theorem 20. We construct the integers in Tables 8 and 9 as ones having the properties that we described in Subsubsection 5.1.1. In more detail, we construct such integers so that every integer greater than μ_{φ_2} can be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of these integers but any integer in $[\lambda_{\varphi_2}, \mu_{\varphi_2}]$ cannot. Intuitively speaking, every integer in Tables 8 and 9 is a kind of dummy. For convenience, each row in Tables 8 and 9 is tagged with a variable or a clause in the 1st column although any integer in Tables 8 and 9 do not have a role for simulating a 3-CNF formula. If we select integers, one each for every variable and clause in Tables 8 and 9, then we can represent an integer greater than μ_{φ_2} as their sum, and vice versa.

We describe more details of integers in Tables 8 and 9. Let β be the binary representation of an integer between the 1st and 12th rows in Table 8; i.e., the binary representation of an integer whose first column of Table 8 is a variable in X. Let l be 1 if β is of one of the 1st and 7th rows; and 2 otherwise. In each of the *XA*, *X1*, and *X2* parts of β, 1 occurs at most once. However, in at least one of its *XA*, *X1*, and *X2* parts, 1 occurs. In each of

its *XA* and *X2* parts, if 1 occurs, then the position is the l-th bit of the part. In its *X1* part of β, if 1 occurs, then the position is the $((l+1) \mod 2)$-th bit of the part, where the modulus 2 is from the number of variables in X, occurring in φ_2. For avoiding invalidly simulating a 3-CNF formula, the position of the bit of 1 is shifted in the *X1* part. Similarly, we construct the integers between the 13rd and 24th rows. In each binary representation of Table 8, the integer represented in its *1S* part is equal to the maximum number of 1s in its remaining parts. On the other hand, in Table 9, the integer represented in its *1S* part is equal to $c+1$ in its remaining parts, where c is the maximum number of bits of 1s. The difference of the *1S* parts in integers in Tables 8 and 9 is for representing every integer greater than μ_{φ_2} instead of every integer greater than or equal to λ_{φ_2}.

Table 8: Integers constructed from φ_2, which are introduced for the reduction to Thr NS Gaps.

Variables	Assigned	Constructed integers								Decimal
or clauses	values	*1S*	*C2*	*C1*	*Y2*	*Y1*	*X2*	*X1*	*XA*	notations
x_1	001	3	00	00	00	00	00	00	01	49153
x_1	010	3	00	00	00	00	00	10	00	49160
x_1	011	3	00	00	00	00	00	10	01	49161
x_1	100	3	00	00	00	00	01	00	00	49168
x_1	101	3	00	00	00	00	01	00	01	49169
x_1	110	3	00	00	00	00	01	10	00	49176
x_1	111	3	00	00	00	00	01	10	01	49177
x_2	001	3	00	00	00	00	00	00	10	49154
x_2	010	3	00	00	00	00	00	01	00	49156
x_2	011	3	00	00	00	00	00	01	10	49158
x_2	100	3	00	00	00	00	10	00	00	49184
x_2	101	3	00	00	00	00	10	00	10	49186
y_1	01	2	00	00	00	10	00	00	00	32896
y_1	10	2	00	00	01	00	00	00	00	33024
y_1	11	2	00	00	01	10	00	00	00	33152
y_2	01	2	00	00	00	01	00	00	00	32832
y_2	10	2	00	00	10	00	00	00	00	33280
y_2	11	2	00	00	10	01	00	00	00	33344
c_1	01	2	00	10	00	00	00	00	00	34816
c_1	10	2	01	00	00	00	00	00	00	36864
c_1	11	2	01	10	00	00	00	00	00	38912
c_2	01	2	00	01	00	00	00	00	00	33792
c_2	10	2	10	00	00	00	00	00	00	40960
c_2	11	2	10	01	00	00	00	00	00	41984

Table 9: Integers constructed from φ_2, which are introduced for the reduction to Thr NS Gaps

Variables	Assigned	Constructed integers								Decimal
or clauses	values	*1S*	*C2*	*C1*	*Y2*	*Y1*	*X2*	*X1*	*XA*	notations
x_2	110	4	00	00	00	00	10	01	00	65572
x_2	111	4	00	00	00	00	10	01	10	65574

5.2 A formal discussion for Theorem 25

Proof of Theorem 25. First we prove #Thr NS Gaps to be in #NP; i.e., $\#\cdot\Pi_1^{\mathsf{P}}$. By Theorem 20, it suffices to show that #Thr NS Gaps is a special case of #NonRep as follows. Let $(\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}, \kappa)$ be an instance of #Thr NS Gaps. Then, by the existence of an upper bound a_n^2 for the maximum element of $N(\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\})$ [Wil78], $N(\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}) \cap [\kappa, \infty]$ is equal to $N(\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}) \cap [\kappa, a_n^2]$. Thus, #Thr NS Gaps is an special case of #NonRep. Consequently, #Thr NS Gaps is in #NP.

Next, we prove that #Thr NS Gaps is #NP-hard under parsimonious reductions. Let φ be given as in the proof for Theorem 20; i.e., φ is a 3-CNF formula over $X \cup Y$. Moreover, let $h, H, [\lambda, \mu]$ and d_0 be defined as in the proof for Theorem 20; i.e., h is a polynomial-time computable function from 3-CNF-formulae to positive integers, H is a set of positive integers, $[\lambda, \mu]$ is an interval of positive integers, and d_0 is a positive integer. By the proof for Theorem 20, we can construct $h, H, [\lambda, \mu]$ and d_0 in polynomial time.

For φ, we will construct a function s_0 such that

$$|\{\sigma_x \in \{0,1\}^{k_1} \colon (\forall \sigma_y \in \{0,1\}^{k_2})[(2, \varphi, \sigma_x\sigma_y) \in \Phi_{1/3}]\}|$$

is equal to $|N(s_0(\varphi)) \cap [\lambda, \infty]|$, where $\Phi_{1/3}$ is the set defined in Subsection 2.4. Then, we will construct dummy integers such as the integers in Table 8 for the formula φ_2 in Subsection 5.1. For every $x_i \in X_\varphi$, $b_1, b_2, b_3 \in \{0,1\}$, we define an integer $d(x_i, b_3b_2b_1)$ as

$$3d_0 + 2^{2k_1+i-1}b_3 + 2^{k_1+(i \bmod k_1)}b_2 + 2^{i-1}b_1.$$

Figure 6 illustrates $d(x_i, b_3b_2b_1)$. We can construct $d(x_i, b_3b_2b_1)$ in polynomial time. Similarly, for every $y_i \in Y_\varphi$, $b_1, b_2 \in \{0,1\}$, we define an integer $d(y_i, b_2b_1)$ as

$$2d_0 + 2^{3k_1+k_2+i-1}b_2 + 2^{3k_1+(i \bmod k_2)}b_1.$$

Figure 7 illustrates $d(y_i, b_2b_1)$. We can construct $d(y_i, b_2b_1)$ in polynomial time. For every clause C_i with $1 \leq i \leq k_3$ and $b_1, b_2 \in \{0,1\}$, we define an integer $d(C_i, b_2b_1)$ as

$$2d_0 + 2^{3k_1+2k_2+k_3+i-1}b_2 + 2^{3k_1+2k_2+(i \bmod k_3)}b_1,$$

Figure 8 illustrates $d(C_i, b_2b_1)$. We can construct $d(C_i, b_2b_1)$ in polynomial time. For every $x \in X_\varphi$, we denote the set $\{d(x, \beta) \colon \beta \in \{0,1\}^3 \backslash \{000\}\}$ by $D(x)$. Moreover, for every $z \in Y_\varphi \cup \mathcal{C}_\varphi$, we denote the set $\{d(z, \beta) \colon \beta \in \{0,1\}^2 \backslash \{00\}\}$ by $D(z)$. We can construct $D(z)$ in polynomial time since each element of $D(z)$ can be constructed in polynomial time and $|D(z)|$ is $3k_2$ or $3k_3$.

For every $x \in X_\varphi$ and $\beta \in \{0,1\}^3$, we denote the integer $d(x, \beta) + d_0$ by $d_+(x, \beta)$; i.e., the integer $d_+(x, \beta)$ denotes the integer obtained from $d(x, \beta)$



Figure 6: The integer $d(x_i, b_3b_2b_1)$ constructed in the proof for Theorem 25.



Figure 7: The integer $d(y_i, b_2b_1)$ constructed in the proof for Theorem 25.



Figure 8: The integer $d(C_i, b_2b_1)$ constructed in the proof for Theorem 25.

by incrementing its *1S* part. We denote the set $\bigcup_{z \in X_\varphi \cup Y_\varphi \cup \mathcal{C}_\varphi} D(z)$ by D. Moreover, we denote the set

$$(D \backslash \{d(x_{k_1}, 110), d(x_{k_1}, 111)\}) \cup \{d_+(x_{k_1}, 110), d_+(x_{k_1}, 111)\}$$

by D_+. We define $s_0(\varphi)$ as the set

$$H \cup D_+ \cup \{d_0\}.$$

By the above construction, we can construct $s_0(\varphi)$ in polynomial time.

Then we will show the validity of the constructed reduction. In the rest of the proof for Theorem 25, let $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_\iota$ be integers in $s_0(\varphi)$ and let α be the sum of $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_\iota$. For every $1 \leq \kappa \leq \iota$, let ξ_κ be $\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \alpha_i$. For any nonnegative integer e, we say that e is *consistent* with φ if e satisfies the same condition as in the proof for Theorem 20. Note that this notion is well-defined for any nonnegative integer. Moreover, by definition, if α is in $[\lambda, \varphi]$, then α is consistent with φ. We can prove the following claim by the similar discussion as in the proof for Claim 22.

Claim 26. *ξ_i is consistent with φ for every $1 \leq i \leq \iota$ if and only if no carry occurs at the XA, X1, X2, Y1, Y2, C1, and C2 parts in the addition $\xi_{i-1} + \alpha_i$ for every $2 \leq i \leq \iota$.*

Claim 27. *If $\alpha \in [\lambda, \mu]$ and there is no $S \subseteq H$ such that $\sum_{\tau \in S} \tau = \alpha$, then $\alpha \in N(s_0(\varphi))$.*



Figure 9: Integers in the interval $[\lambda, \mu + d_0]$.

Proof of Claim 27. Let α be in $[\lambda, \mu]$. Let S_1 be a subset of H and S_2 be a subset of D_+ such that $\sum_{\tau \in S_1 \cup S_2} \tau = \alpha$. By assumption, S_2 is not empty since $S_2 = \emptyset$ implies that $S_1 \subseteq H$ and $\sum_{\tau \in S_1} \tau = \alpha$. Assume that $S_1 \neq \emptyset$ and α is in $[\lambda, \mu]$. Then, by the definition of integers in H and D_+, at least one carry occurs in one of the *X1*, *X2*, *Y1*, *Y2*, *C1*, *C2* parts. This contradicts to Claim 26. □(Claim 27)

Figure 9 illustrates every integer in $[\lambda, \mu + d_0]$.

Claim 28. *If $\alpha \geq \mu + 1$, then we can find a set $S \subseteq D_+$ such that $\sum_{\tau \in S} \tau = \alpha$.*

Proof of Claim 28. By the definitions of integers in D_+, we can represent every integer in $[\mu + 1, \mu + d_0]$ as a nonnegative integer combination of D_+. Thus, the claim holds. □(Claim 28)

Claim 29. *All integers in $s_0(\varphi)$ are coprime.*

Proof of Claim 29. By definition, D contains two successive integers; e.g., $d(x_1, 010)$ and $d(x_1, 011)$. By Euclidean algorithm (Chapter 4 in [GKP94]), two successive integers are coprime. Thus, all integers in $s_0(\varphi)$ are coprime. □(Claim 29)

Moreover, we can check that Claim 23 holds even if α is defined as an integer represented as a nonnegative integer combination of $H \cup D_+ \cup \{d_0\}$. The proof for Theorem 25 is complete. □(Theorem 25)

6 The complexity of #NS Gaps

In this section, we prove the following theorem by extending the reduction in the proof for Theorem 25 to a reduction from #·Π1 1IN3SAT to #NS Gaps. The type of reduction that we adopt is a relaxed subtractive reduction.

Theorem 30. #NS Gaps *is* #NP*-complete under relaxed subtractive reductions.*

6.1 The closure property of $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ under relaxed subtractive reductions

In Subsection 2.3, we introduced a new type of polynomial-time reduction that we call a relaxed subtractive reduction. In this subsection, we prove that $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ is closed under relaxed subtractive reductions. The proof takes the same approach as the proofs for the closure property of $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ under subtractive reductions [DHK05] and complementive reductions [BBC$^+$10].

Theorem 31. *For any $k \geq 1$, the class $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ is closed under relaxed subtractive reductions.*

Proof of Theorem 31. Let $\#A$ and $\#B$ be counting problems. Suppose that $\#B \in \#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$. Let a pair (t_0, t_1) of polynomial-time computable functions be a relaxed subtractive reduction from $\#A$ to $\#B$ and $F \in \mathsf{P}$ be a decision problem such that $\#F \in \mathsf{FP}$, which satisfy the following conditions. For any input w of A,

1. $W_F(w) \subseteq W_B(t_0(w))$
2. $W_B(t_1(w)) \subseteq W_B(t_0(w))$
3. $W_F(w) \cap W_B(t_1(w)) = \emptyset$
4. $|W_A(w)| = |W_B(t_0(w))| - |W_B(t_1(w))| - |W_F(w)|$.

The above 4 conditions are from the definition of a strong relaxed subtractive reduction. For proving the theorem, it suffices to show that

(S1) there is a decision problem A' such that $R_{A'} \in \mathsf{P}^{\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}}$,

(S2) $|W_{A'}(w)| = |W_A(w)|$.

By the equality $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}} = \#\cdot\mathsf{P}^{\Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}}$ [Tod91a], the statement (S1) implies that $\#A' \in \#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$. The statements (S1) and (S2) imply that $\#A \in \#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$.

Let $R_{A'}$ consist of all pairs $(w, w_0\#w_1\#v)$ such that $w_0 = t_0(w)$, $w_1 = t_1(w)$, and $v \in (W_B(w_0)\backslash W_B(w_1))\backslash W_F(w)$, where $\#$ is a new symbol. We will show $w_0\#w_1\#v$ to be a witness of w by using a deterministic oracle machine M^{L_B} that recognizes B for some oracle $L_B \in \Sigma_k^{\mathsf{P}}$.

Let γ denote $w_0\#w_1\#v$. We can extract w_0 from γ in polynomial time. Moreover, we can check whether w_0 is obtained from w in polynomial time, since t_0 is a polynomial-time computable function. We can do the same process for w_1 in γ. After doing these processes, we extract (w_0, v) from γ and check that v is in $W_B(w_0)$. These processes can be done in polynomial time since we can extract (w_0, v) in polynomial time and by using the oracle

L_B, we can check that v is in $W_B(w_0)$ in polynomial time. Similarly, we can execute the following steps in polynomial time. We extract (w_1, v) from γ and check that v are not in $W_B(w_1)$ by using oracle queries for L_B. Finally, we check (w, v) to be not in R_F. We can execute this step in polynomial-time since we assume $\#F$ to be in FP. Thus, $\#A'$ is in $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$. By definition, $|W_{A'}(w)|$ is equal to $|(W_B(t_0(w))\backslash W_B(t_1(w)))\backslash W_F(w)|$.

By assumption, $W_A(w)$ is $W_B(t_0(w))\backslash W_B(t_1(w))\backslash W_F(w)$. Thus, $|W_{A'}(w)|$ is equal to $|W_A(w)|$. This implies that $\#A' = \#A$. Consequently, $\#A$ is in $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$. The proof is complete. □

6.2 Ideas and examples of the reduction

In this subsection, we describe main ideas of our reduction from $\#\cdot\Pi_1$1IN3SAT to #NS Gaps. In Section 5, we have proved that $\#\cdot\Pi_1$1IN3SAT is parsimonious reducible to #Thr NS Gaps. This implies $\#\cdot\Pi_1$1IN3SAT is also relaxed subtractive reducible to #Thr NS Gaps. By extending the reduction in the proof for Theorem 25, we will construct a strong relaxed subtractive reduction from $\#\cdot\Pi_1$1IN3SAT to #NS Gaps.

Let $X, Y, \varphi, [\lambda, \mu], H, h, s_0$ be as in the proof for Theorem 25. Our goal is obtaining a function s_1 and a problem $F \in \mathsf{P}$ that satisfy the following conditions.

(C1) Every integer in $N(s_0(\varphi)) \cap [\lambda, \mu]$ is in $N(s_0(\varphi))\backslash N(s_1(\varphi))$.

(C2) F coincides $(N(s_0(\varphi))\backslash N(s_1(\varphi))) \cap [1, \lambda - 1]$.

As a result, we want to construct a strong relaxed subtractive reduction (s_0, s_1) such that

$$|N(s_0(\varphi)) \cap [\lambda, \infty]| = |N(s_0(\varphi))| - |N(s_1(\varphi))| - |W_F(\varphi)|.$$

We informally describe such a strong relaxed subtractive reduction (s_0, s_1) by an example. For simplicity, we first consider an example such that a pair of a set of positive integers and an interval are given but not constructed by any 3-CNF formula. Let $(S, [28, 31])$ be given, where $S = \{8, 9, 14\}$. We simulate every integer in $N(S) \cap [1, 27]$ as an integer in $N(T) \cup U$ as in Figure 10, where $T = \{8, 9, 10, 14\}$ and $U = \{10, 19, 20\}$. That is, U denotes the set $N(S)\backslash N(T)$. In Figure 10, every circle means an integer and each of three lines represents gaps and nongaps of the numerical semigroup generated by S, T, U, respectively. On the 1st and 2nd lines, every black circle means that the corresponding integer is a nongap of $\mathcal{S}(S)$ and $\mathcal{S}(T)$; every gray circle means that the corresponding integer is an element of S and T; and every white circle means the corresponding integer is a gap of $\mathcal{S}(S)$ and $\mathcal{S}(T)$, respectively.

We specify all integers of $\mathcal{S}(S) \cap [1, 27]$ by partitioning $\mathcal{S}(S) \cap [1, 27]$ into two sets. The 1st set is $N(S) \cap N(T)$. The 2nd set is $N(S)\backslash N(T)$; i.e.,



Figure 10: Gaps and nongaps of numerical semigroups generated by S, T, U and a set F, where $S = \{8, 9, 14\}$, $T = \{8, 9, 10, 14\}$, $U = \{2, 7\}$, $F = \{10, 19, 20\}$

U. In Figure 10, integers in $[1, 7] \cup [11, 13] \cup \{15, 21\}$ are in $N(S) \cap N(T)$. Moreover, U consists of 10, 19 and 20

Next, we consider an instance of #NS Gaps constructed from a given instance of $\# \cdot \Pi_1$1IN3SAT. Let φ_2 be the 3-CNF formula defined as in Subsubsection 5.1.2. Let $s_0(\varphi_2)$ be a set consisting of $\{d_0\}$ and all integers in Tables 6, 8 and 10. Let $s_1(\varphi_2)$ be a set consisting of $\{d_0\}$ and all integers in Tables 6 and 8 to 10. Then, we specify all integers in $N(s_0(\varphi_2)) \cap [\lambda_{\varphi_2}, \infty]$ as follows. Since $s_0(\varphi_2)$ is a subset of $s_1(\varphi_2)$, $N(s_0(\varphi_2))$ contains $N(s_1(\varphi_2))$ as a subset; i.e., any integer that cannot be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of $s_0(\varphi_2)$ cannot be represented as one on $s_1(\varphi_2)$. Thus, all remaining tasks that we have to do is a specification of all integers in $(N(s_0(\varphi_2)) \backslash N(s_1(\varphi_2))) \cap [1, \lambda - 1]$, which we denote by F. Moreover, we can observe that $N(s_1(\varphi_2))$ does not include any gap greater than λ_{φ_2} by checking each bit of each integer in $s_1(\varphi_2)$ in Tables 6 and 8 to 10 and λ_{φ_2} in Table 7.

Table 10: Integers constructed from φ_2, which are introduced for the reduction to NS Gaps.

Variables	Assigned	Constructed integers								Decimal
or clauses	values	*1S*	*C2*	*C1*	*Y2*	*Y1*	*X2*	*X1*	*XA*	notations
x_2	110	3	00	00	00	00	10	01	00	49188
x_2	111	3	00	00	00	00	10	01	10	49190

6.3 A formal discussion for Theorem 30

Proof of Theorem 30. Since the problem #NS Gaps is a special case of #Thr NS Gaps by definition, #NS Gaps is in #NP by Theorem 25. Thus,

all that is left is to prove #NS Gaps to be #NP-hard under relaxed subtractive reductions.



Figure 11: An Euler diagram for the strong relaxed subtractive reduction that we construct in the proof for Theorem 30, where $B = \#\cdot\Pi_1 1\text{IN3SAT}$.

Let φ be fixed as in the proof for Theorem 25. Let $[\lambda, \mu], H, h$, and s_0 be constructed in polynomial time as in the proof for Theorem 25. We will construct polynomial-time computable function s_1 in polynomial time and find a decision problem F such that

(C1) $N(s_1(\varphi)) \subseteq N(s_0(\varphi))$,

(C2) $W_F(\varphi) \subseteq N(s_0(\varphi))$,

(C3) $N(s_1(\varphi)) \cap W_F(\varphi) = \emptyset$,

(C4) There is a $\sigma_x \in \{0,1\}^{|X_\varphi|}$ such that $(k, \varphi, \sigma_x\sigma_y) \notin \Phi_{1/3}$ for every $\sigma_y \in \{0,1\}^{|Y_\varphi|}$ if and only if there is an integer in $(N(s_0(\varphi))\backslash N(s_1(\varphi)) \setminus W_F(\varphi)$.

Figure 11 illustrates the relation of $N(s_0(\varphi))$, $N(s_1(\varphi))$, and $W_F(\varphi)$. Let $\tilde{D}_+$ denote the set $D_+ \cup \{d(x, 110), d(x, 111)\}$; i.e., $D \cup \{d_+(x, 110), d_+(x, 111)\}$. We define $s_1(\varphi)$ as

$$H \cup \tilde{D}_+ \cup \{d_0\} \qquad \text{i.e.,} \qquad s_0(\varphi) \cup \{d(x_{k_1}, 110), d(x_{k_1}, 111)\}.$$

We can check s_1 to be constructed in polynomial time as the construction of s_0 in the proof for Theorem 25.

Next we can show the existence of the decision problem F. For defining F, we denote the function d by d_φ. Let R_F be an polynomially balanced binary relation defined as follows. A pair (f, v) is in R_F if and only if f is a 3-CNF formula and v is the sum of all positive integers in a set B_f, where B_f satisfies the condition that

- exactly one of $d_f(x_{l_1}, 110)$ and $d_f(x_{l_1}, 111)$ is in B_f,
- for every $x \in X_f \backslash \{x_{l_1}\}$, at most one in $\{d_f(x, \beta) \colon \beta \in \{0,1\}^3, \beta \neq 000\}$ is in B_f, and
- for every $z \in Y_f \cup \mathcal{C}_f$, at most one in $\{d_f(z, \beta) \colon \beta \in \{0,1\}^2, \beta \neq 00\}$ is in B_f,

where $l_1 = |X_f|$, $l_2 = |Y_f|$, and $l_3 = |\mathcal{C}_f|$. Then, an instance of the decision problem F is a 3-CNF f over $X \cup Y$, the question of F is whether there is an integer v such that $(f, v) \in R_F$. By definition, the decision problem F is in P. Moreover, $\#F(f)$ is $2 \cdot 8^{l_1 - 1} \cdot 4^{l_2 + l_3}$; i.e., $2^{3l_1 + 2l_2 + 2l_3 - 2}$, which is computable in time polynomial in l_1, l_2, and l_3. Thus,the counting problem $\#F$ is in FP.

In the rest of the proof for Theorem 30, we will show the validity of the above construction. Let $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_\iota$ be integers in $s_1(\varphi)$ and let α be the sum of $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_\iota$. For every $1 \leq \kappa \leq \iota$, let ξ_i be $\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \alpha_i$. For any nonnegative integer e, we say that e is *consistent* with φ if e satisfies the same condition as in the proof for Theorem 25. We can prove the following claim by the similar discussion in the proof for Theorems 20 and 25.

Claim 32. *ξ_i is consistent with φ for every $1 \leq i \leq \iota$ if and only if no carry occurs at the XA, X1, X2, Y1, Y2, C1, and C2 parts in the addition $\xi_{i-1} + \alpha_i$ for every $2 \leq i \leq \iota$.*

By Claim 32, we can verify Claims 33,34, and 35.

Claim 33. *If $\alpha \geq \lambda$, then we can find a set $S \subseteq \tilde{D}_+ \cup \{d_0\}$ such that $\sum_{\tau \in S} \tau = \alpha$.*

Claim 34. *If $\alpha \in [\lambda, \mu]$ and there is no $S \subseteq H$ such that $\sum_{\tau \in S} \tau = \alpha$, then $\alpha \in N(s_0(\varphi))$.*

Claim 35. *Let α be less than λ. $\alpha \in W_F(\varphi)$ if and only if there is an $K \subseteq s_1(\varphi)$ such that $\sum_{\tau \in K} \tau = \alpha$ and there is no $L \subseteq s_0(\varphi)$ such that $\sum_{\tau \in L} \tau = \alpha$*

We can observe the validities of the statements of Claims 33,34, and 35 by using an example of Figure 10 in Subsection 6.2. Let S, T, and U be as in Subsection 6.2. S, T and U correspond to $s_0(\varphi)$, $s_1(\varphi)$, and $W_F(\varphi)$, respectively. Claim 33 corresponds to the fact that every integer greater than or equal to the lower endpoint 28 can be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of T. Claim 34 corresponds to the facts that 29 can be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of T but cannot as one of S. Claim 35 corresponds to the facts that $10, 19$ and 20 can be represented as a nonnegative integer combination of T but cannot as one of S; i.e. $10, 19$ and 20 is in U. The following claim follows from Claim 29.

Claim 36. *All integers in $s_1(\varphi)$ are coprime.*

By definition, the pair (s_0, s_1) satisfies the conditions of strong relaxed subtractive reductions. The proof for Theorem 30 is complete. □(Theorem 30)

7 Future work

In this paper, we proved the #NP-completeness of the numerical semigroup gap counting problem #NS Gaps under relaxed subtractive reductions, where a relaxed subtractive reduction is new type of polynomial-time reduction. Moreover, we proved the #NP-completenesses of #NonRep and #Thr NS Gaps, which are variants of #NS Gaps, under parsimonious reductions. This section describes future work.

7.1 The #NP-hardness of #NS Gaps under parsimonious reducibility

We showed the #NP-completeness of the problem #NS Gaps under relaxed subtractive reductions. It is natural to ask whether #NS Gaps is #NP-complete under parsimonious reductions. However, it appears to be quite difficult to answer the question. From our current knowledge, it is not easy even to conjecture whether the answer is positive or negative. If we believe the hypothesis $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$, then #NS Gaps appears to be not #NP-hard under parsimonious reductions since we can find a gap of a numerical semigroup in polynomial time. For example, given a set A of coprime positive integers $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ as an input of #NS Gaps, all integers from 1 to $a_1 - 1$ are gaps of $\mathcal{S}(A)$. Moreover, if we check every integer greater than a_1 in ascending order, then we can find a gap of $\mathcal{S}(A)$ in at most n step. However, we know at least the largest gap of $\mathcal{S}$, the Frobenius number $g(A)$, to be hard to find [Mat16]. Thus, even if $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$, #NS Gaps may be #NP-complete under parsimonious reductions. For constructing such a parsimonious reduction,

In this paper, we mainly use combinatorial and logical approaches for constructing reductions, but use little strong result in number theory. Thus, it may be possible to prove #NS Gaps to be #NP-complete under parsimonious reductions by using some tools developed in number theory. Cook said that the primality testing problem for integers requires a deep insight on number theory in his seminal paper [Coo71]. Indeed, over thirty years later, Agrawal, Kayal, and Saxena [AKS04] found a polynomial-time algorithm by an approach from number theory.

7.2 Proof methods for the #NP-hardness of #Thr NS Gaps

To prove the #NP hardness of #Thr NS Gaps, we reduced $\#\cdot\Pi_1$1IN3SAT to #Thr NS Gaps. However, a reduction from #NonRep to #Thr NS Gaps

is another natural reduction. Since the latter reduction is a self-reduction, it appears to be more natural than our reduction. Nevertheless, we could not adopt this approach by the following obstacle.

A parsimonious reduction from #NonRep to #Thr NS Gaps requires a deep insight into number theoretical aspects of numerical semigroups. No polynomial-time algorithm is known for finding an instance (A, κ) of #Thr NS Gaps such that

(C1) $|N(A) \cap [\kappa, \infty]| = |N(A') \cap [\lambda, \mu]|$ and

(C2) the size of (A, κ) is of polynomial order in the size of $(A', [\lambda, \mu])$

for a given instance $(A', [\lambda, \mu])$ of #NonRep. To the author's knowledge, little relation is known for an instance of #Thr NS Gaps and an instance of #NonRep. Our reduction in Section 5 makes use of properties originated from an instance of $\# \cdot \Pi_1$1IN3SAT.

7.3 Completeness problems of #NP under a more general reducibilities

We introduced relaxed subtractive reductions as a generalization of subtractive reductions. Moreover, relaxed subtractive reductions are also special case of polynomial-time (bounded) truth-table reductions [LLS75] since the set F in Definition 1 is polynomial-time computable. As a property of polynomial-time truth-table reductions, relaxed subtractive reductions have nonadaptivity; i.e., how to use the responses of all oracle queries is decided before starting all processes. Moreover, in relaxed subtractive reductions, the other processes are also independent of the two oracle queries, which are polynomial-time computable. We can consider that a $\# \cdot \Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$-complete problem exists under relaxed subtractive reductions due to this property. However, we do not know whether there is a more general type of nonadaptive reduction under which $\# \cdot \Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ is closed. This is an interesting subject since $\#\cdot\Pi_k^{\mathsf{P}}$ is not closed under polynomial-time 1 Turing reductions [TW92].

References

[AB09] Sanjeev Arora and Boaz Barak. *Computational Complexity: a Modern Approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[AKS04] Manindra Agrawal, Neeraj Kayal, and Nitin Saxena. PRIMES is in P. *Annals of Mathematics*, 160(2):781–793, 2004.

[BBC+10] Michael Bauland, Elmar Böhler, Nadia Creignou, Steffen Reith, Henning Schnoor, and Heribert Vollmer. The complexity of problems for quantified constraints. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 47(2):454–490, 2010.

[BHNW05] Dale Beihoffer, Jemimah Hendry, Albert Nijenhuis, and Stan Wagon. Faster algorithms for Frobenius numbers. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 12(#R27), 2005.

[BW03] Alexander Barvinok and Kevin Woods. Short rational generating functions for lattice point problems. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 16(4):957–979, 2003.

[CH96] Nadia Creignou and Miki Hermann. Complexity of generalized satisfiability counting problems. *Information and Computation*, 125(1):1–12, 1996.

[CKS81] Ashok K. Chandra, Dexter C. Kozen, and Larry J. Stockmeyer. Alternation. *J. ACM*, 28:114–133, January 1981.

[Coo71] Stephen A. Cook. The complexity of theorem-proving procedures. In *Proceedings of the third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, STOC '71, pages 151–158, New York, NY, USA, 1971. ACM.

[DHK05] Arnaud Durand, Miki Hermann, and Phokion G. Kolaitis. Subtractive reductions and complete problems for counting complexity classes. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 340(3):496–513, 2005.

[DK00] Ding-Zhu Du and Ker-I Ko. *Theory of Computational Complexity.* John Wiley & Sons, 2000.

[ELSW07] David Einstein, Daniel Lichtblau, Adam Strzebonski, and Stan Wagon. Frobenius numbers by lattice point enumeration. *Integers*, 7(1):A15, 2007.

[GKP94] Ronald L. Graham, Donald E. Knuth, and Oren Patashnik. *Concrete Mathematics: a Foundation for Computer Science.* Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Boston, MA, USA, 2nd edition, 1994.

[HP09] Miki Hermann and Reinhard Pichler. Complexity of counting the optimal solutions. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(38-40):3814–3825, 2009.

[HP10] Miki Hermann and Reinhard Pichler. Counting complexity of propositional abduction. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 76(7):634–649, 2010.

[HV95] Lane A. Hemaspaandra and Heribert Vollmer. The satanic notations: Counting classes beyond $\#P$ and other definitional adventures. *SIGACT News*, 26(1):2–13, March 1995.

[Kan92] Ravi Kannan. Lattice translates of a polytope and the Frobenius problem. *Combinatorica*, 12(2):161–177, 1992.

[Kre92] Mark W. Krentel. Generalizations of opt p to the polynomial hierarchy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 97(2):183–198, 1992.

[LLS75] R.E. Ladner, N.A. Lynch, and A.L. Selman. A comparison of polynomial time reducibilities. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 1(2):103–123, 1975.

[Mat16] Shunichi Matsubara. The computational complexity of the Frobenius problem. *CoRR*, abs/1602.05657, 2016.

[MS72] Albert R. Meyer and Larry J. Stockmeyer. The equivalence problem for regular expressions with squaring requires exponential space. In *Switching and Automata Theory, 1972., IEEE Conference Record of 13th Annual Symposium on*, pages 125–129, October 1972.

[Pap94] Cristos H. Papadimitriou. *Computational Complexity*. Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1994.

[PS82] Christos H. Papadimitriou and Kenneth Steiglitz. *Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Complexity*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1982.

[RA96] Jorge L Ramírez Alfonsín. Complexity of the Frobenius problem. *Combinatorica*, 16(1):143–147, 1996.

[RA05] Jorge L Ramírez Alfonsín. *The Diophantine Frobenius Problem*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.

[RGS09] José C Rosales and Pedro A García-Sánchez. *Numerical Semigroups*, volume 20. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.

[Rou08] Bjarke Hammersholt Roune. Solving thousand-digit Frobenius problems using Gröbner bases. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 43(1):1–7, 2008.

[Sch78] Thomas J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '78, pages 216–226, New York, NY, USA, 1978. ACM.

[Sto76] Larry J. Stockmeyer. The polynomial-time hierarchy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 3(1):1–22, 1976.

[SU02a] Marcus Schäfer and Christopher Umans. Completeness in the polynomial-time hierarchy: Part I: a compendium. *SIGACT News*, 33(4):22–36, December 2002.

[SU02b] Marcus Schäfer and Christopher Umans. Guest column: Completeness in the polynomial-time hierarchy: Part II. *SIGACT News*, 33(3):32–49, 2002.

[Syl82] J. J. Sylvester. On subvariants, i.e. semi-invariants to binary quantics of an unlimited order. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 5(1):79–136, 1882.

[Tod91a] Seinosuke Toda. *Computational Complexity of Counting Complexity Classes*. Ph.D. dissertation, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 1991.

[Tod91b] Seinosuke Toda. PP is as hard as the polynomial-time hierarchy. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 20(5):865–877, October 1991.

[TW92] Seinosuke Toda and Osamu Watanabe. Polynomial-time 1-Turing reductions from $\#PH$ to $\#P$. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 100(1):205–221, 1992.

[Val79a] Leslie G. Valiant. The complexity of computing the permanent. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 8(2):189–201, 1979.

[Val79b] Leslie G. Valiant. The complexity of enumeration and reliability problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 8(3):410–412, August 1979.

[Wil78] Herbert S. Wilf. A circle-of-lights algorithm for the "money-changing problem". *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 85(7):562–565, 1978.

[Wra76] Celia Wrathall. Complete sets and the polynomial-time hierarchy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 3(1):23–33, 1976.